

## SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1959

*(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 15, 1959)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thy voice, O God, is calling  
Its summons unto men;  
As once Thou spake in Zion,  
So now it speaks again.

To this anguished generation we hear  
Thy voice saying in all the woe of Thy world—

I hear My people crying  
In cot and mine and slum;  
No field or mart is silent,  
No city street is dumb.

I see My people falling  
In darkness and despair.  
Whom shall I send to shatter  
The fetters which they bear?

We heed, O Lord, Thy summons,  
And answer: Here are we.  
Send us upon Thine errand,  
Let us Thy servants be.

Our strength is dust and ashes,  
Our years a passing hour;  
But Thou canst use our weakness  
To magnify Thy power.

From ease and plenty save us;  
From pride of place absolve;  
Purge us of low desire;  
Lift us to high resolve.

Take us, and make us holy;  
Teach us Thy will and way.  
Speak, and, behold: we answer;  
Command, and we obey.

And Thine shall be the kingdom, and  
the power and the glory. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 17, 1959, was dispensed with.

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 17, 1959,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably, with amendments, on April 18, 1959, the bill (H.R. 5916) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 207) thereon.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

## U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Coast Guard nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Coast Guard nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are approved.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

## REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OPERATIONS, BUSINESS AND DISASTER LOANS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on liquidation operations, business and disaster loans of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarterly period ended December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PROJECT PROPOSAL UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Hights Creek Irrigation Co., of Kaysville, Utah, had applied for a loan of \$214,000 for project works estimated to cost \$228,000; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

## By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Finance:

## "HOUSE RESOLUTION 138

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a sliding scale tariff on lead imports for the purpose of combating excessive foreign imports on the market

"Whereas the excess of foreign imports flooding the lead market has driven prices down and reduced the demand for domestically produced lead; and

"Whereas the lead industry, as a result, is in severe financial difficulties which will necessitate curtailment of operations unless the Government provides some effective aid; and

"Whereas, one company has been forced to borrow \$20 million to carry its inventories and to help develop lower cost sources of lead and as of February has gone on a 4-day week in the six southeast Missouri counties where the company operates; and

"Whereas, the quotas which were imposed on lead imports have been ineffective to control the situation and contain loopholes which are being exploited to the detriment of the domestic industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Missouri House of Representatives in its 70th General Assembly request of the Congress of the United States that it enact legislation establishing a sliding scale tariff on lead imports; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Missouri Members of the House and Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO CALL A CONVENTION TO PROPOSE A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT THE STATES FROM LEVYING TAXES UPON THE INCOMES OF NONRESIDENTS

"Whereas, several States levy an income tax at the source which is enforced against the incomes of nonresidents derived from employment in said States; and

"Whereas residents of other States are employed in States having such taxes and are being subjected to such tax; and

"Whereas it is highly unjust, inequitable, and discriminatory that such nonresidents be compelled to contribute through said tax to the support of the government of States in which they have no voice, and from which they receive little benefit, the same being a clear case of taxation without representation and contrary to all the principles upon which the American system of government is founded: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate with the house of representatives concurring, That the General Court of the State of New Hampshire, being the legislature of said State, hereby makes application that the Congress, acting in conformity with article V of the Constitution of the United States, call a convention for proposing amendments to said Constitution; and particularly for proposing an amendment in substantially the following form:

"No State shall make or enforce any law to lay or collect any tax on the income derived from wages, salaries, professional fees, and other amounts received as compensation for personal services actually rendered, of any natural person who is not a resident of that State; further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and two copies to the secretary of state of each State of the Union with a request that he lay one of such copies before each branch of the legislature of his State, and that he further transmit copies hereof to the members of the New Hampshire delegation in Congress.

"STEWART LAMPREY,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"NORMAN G. PACKARD,

"President of the Senate.

"WESLEY LOWELL,

"Governor.

"April 8, 1959.

"Attest:

"HARRY E. JACKSON,

"Secretary of State."

#### JOHN FOSTER DULLES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of New York recently adopted a concurrent resolution expressing the gratitude of the people of the State of New York to the Honorable John Foster Dulles.

Because this concurrent resolution expresses so well many of the feelings with respect to Mr. Dulles that are in the hearts of all Americans, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent reso-

lution be published in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND ASSEMBLY EXPRESSING THE GRATITUDE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK TO JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Whereas the Honorable John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State of the United States of America, has dedicated and devoted the extraordinary span of his great career of public service to the quest for peace and freedom; and

Whereas his distinguished service in the area of foreign affairs and international diplomacy has benefited and will continue to benefit not only the people of the United States of America but all of mankind and humanity; and

Whereas his determination and zeal in attaining the goal of enduring peace, with honor and justice, first found official expression and recognition when he participated in the Hague Peace Conference in 1907, the first great 20th century conference designed to substitute reason for violence as the arbiter of international differences; and

Whereas he was an adviser to the American delegation at the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919, which gave creation to President Wilson's magnificent concept of an international association of the world's nations, to act in concert in abandoning war as an instrument of resolving disputes between nations; and

Whereas working with the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, he symbolized the determination of the people of the United States for a bipartisan foreign policy during World War II and later during the critical early years of the cold war; and

Whereas by appointment of President Truman, he was a member of the U.S. delegation at San Francisco in 1945, when most of the governments of the world again created an international organization to enforce and preserve peace; and he represented the United States in the United Nations' General Assembly for several years, and was acting chairman of the U.S. delegation at the General Assembly at Paris in 1948; and

Whereas he served as an advisor to the Secretary of State of the United States at crucial meetings of the major powers' foreign ministers, at London in 1945 and 1947, at Moscow in 1947 and at Paris in 1949; and

Whereas in 1951 he negotiated the peace treaty with the Empire of Japan, an historic agreement under which the peoples of the western free world live in peaceful understanding and amicable relations with a former enemy people who are now staunch allies on the side against evil and darkness; and

Whereas his long service enabled him to bring a valuable continuity to the Office of Secretary of State when President Eisenhower entrusted to him the grave responsibility of conducting our Nation's foreign policy—a responsibility second only to the President's in assuring the survival of freedom; and

Whereas as Secretary of State, he has made lasting contributions to the cause of peace with honor and justice, by policies firm in fundamentals but flexible in execution, enabling our Nation to exert a decisive and timely positive influence in international affairs; and

Whereas as Secretary of State, he has been instrumental in the development of policy and formulation of action which ended

fighting in Korea; enabled our country to effect termination of hostilities in Indo-China, without military involvement; forestalled a Communist invasion across the Formosa Strait; and, by resolute and courageous decision in answer to an appeal by the Government of Lebanon, prevented the Mideast from becoming a Communist crossroads; and

Whereas by his personal dedication, devotion and integrity, and his unflagging zeal and vigor in carrying on this career-long mission for peace, he has kindled in all Americans a deeper understanding and appreciation of their country's responsibility and role in preserving and safeguarding peace, freedom, and justice throughout the world; and

Whereas no American in this century has served our country so long and so effectively, in this crucial area in which war and peace are suspended in balance, or has given his high office such dimensions in distinction; and

Whereas John Foster Dulles is an illustrious son of the State of New York, which he ably represented in the Senate of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate, assembly, concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York express to John Foster Dulles, on behalf of the people of the State of New York, deep gratitude for his statesmanship and contributions to the cause of peace and honor and prayerful wishes for a complete recovery of his health and an early return to active service in the cause to which he has dedicated his life; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate, assembly, concur), that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable John Foster Dulles at Washington, D.C.

#### MULTIPLE TAXATION—RESOLUTION OF CHELSEA, MASS., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution for the purpose of calling the attention of Senators and the country to a problem caused by the recent Supreme Court decisions permitting State taxation of the net income of businesses engaged in interstate commerce. These cases were *Northwestern States Portland Cement Company v. State of Minnesota*, No. 12, October term, 1958, and *T. V. Williams, State Revenue Commissioner v. Stockham Valves and Fittings, Inc.*, No. 33, October term, 1958, both decided February 24, 1959.

The possibility of multiple taxation and the increased complexities of collection are alarming the business community, particularly small business concerns. Their apprehension is well expressed in a resolution just forwarded to me by H. M. Davis on behalf of the board of directors of the Chelsea, Mass., Chamber of Commerce. They have done a great service by calling our attention to this problem.

The Senate Committee on Small Business is studying this question and its first public hearing has been held. It is my hope that the Committee will be able to make recommendations which will encourage small business, strengthen our economy and protect interstate commerce from an unfair burden of taxation.



There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CHELSEA (MASS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently ruled that corporations doing business in interstate commerce are subject to income tax in the various States to which they ship merchandise.

Therefore, the board of directors of the Chelsea Chamber of Commerce, believing that the cost of complying with this law will prove to be excessive and burdensome; that, in many cases, particularly with small manufacturers, these costs will be greater than the taxes involved; that because each State will have its own rate and governing rules, an individual study of the law of each State will be required, entailing excessive labor and expense, has passed the following resolution: Be it

*Resolved by the board of directors of the Chelsea Chamber of Commerce, in meeting assembled on March 18, That this ruling creates an excessive burden and expense on interstate commerce; and be it further*

*Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the press, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.*

**AIRLINE SERVICE IN KANSAS—RESOLUTION OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE OF KANSAS**

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the mayors' committee of the State of Kansas requesting appropriate action in expediting the final decision in the Kansas-Oklahoma Local Service Case, docket No. 5482 and others. The docket referred to pertains to expanded airline service in Kansas. The lack of airline service there has been a detriment to more than half the communities in my State.

The resolution to which I refer is signed by mayors or representatives of Great Bend, Parsons, Salina, Pittsburg, Hays, Independence, Emporia, Goodland, Manhattan, Kansas City, Junction City, Topeka, Concordia, Oberlin, Hill City, Beloit, and 12 municipalities grouped together as joint cities of western Kansas and eastern Colorado.

This resolution was adopted April 15, 1959, the same date on which I telegraphed Ross Beach, president of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, suggesting that he and the mayors of Kansas could be of tremendous help in crystallizing and focusing attention on the State's need for improved air service. The following day I received a telegram advising me of the group's protest against any further delay or continuance in the case of docket No. 5482. Today I received a copy of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**RESOLUTION RELATING TO AIR SERVICE IN KANSAS**

Whereas air service to cities in Kansas has deteriorated in recent years with terminations of service by trunkline carriers to the point that we now have but one certificated trunkline stop in the State of Kansas; and

Whereas Kansas now shows on the map as a virtual blank as far as certificated local carrier air service is concerned; and

Whereas the proceeding known as the Kansas-Oklahoma Local Service Case, docket No. 5482 et al., was instituted over a year ago; hearings therein began on July 15, 1958, but were not concluded until January 8, 1959; and the filing date for briefs to the examiner has been extended repeatedly to May 1, 1959, with a further application for extension pending; and

Whereas in the meantime applications for temporary exemptions to permit interim service have been denied; and

Whereas this lack of acceptable airline service is greatly damaging to our local economies and is thus detrimental to the economy of the entire State: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Mayors' Committee of the State of Kansas, assembled in Salina, Kans., on April 15, 1959, That the Civil Aeronautics Board be urged to expedite the proceeding known as the Kansas-Oklahoma Local Service Case, docket No. 5482 et al., and arrive at an early decision approving service to the cities in Kansas and Oklahoma; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the mayors' committee of the State of Kansas on behalf of the undersigned representatives of 28 cities and Chambers of commerce, representing all 6 congressional districts be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to the hearing examiner and bureau counsel and to all Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Colorado, and Missouri Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Governor of the State of Kansas and the Governor of the State of Oklahoma; to the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce and the Kansas Industrial Development Commission, together with a request that each such official or agency take appropriate action in order to expedite the final decision in the Kansas-Oklahoma Service Case.*

Adopted this 15th day of April 1959.

R. E. Morrison, Great Bend, Kans.; H. Jaeger, Salina, Kans.; Merle O'Loughlin, Hays, Kans.; H. E. Hamlin, Emporia, Kans.; Myron Rooks, Manhattan, Kans.; Robert K. Weary, Junction City, Kans.; Kenen Charles, Parsons, Kans.; James A. Sevell, Pittsburg, Kans.; R. P. Johnson, Independence, Kans.; Selby Howard, Goodland, Kans.; Charles F. Arnold, Kansas City, Kans.; Lawrence R. Finch, Topeka, Kans., Chairman Aviation Commission of Topeka, Kans.

Joint cities of western Kansas and eastern Colorado: Hill City, Kans., Norton, Kans., Oberlin, Kans., Atwood, Kans., Phillipsburg, Kans., Smith Center, Kans., Mankato, Kans., Beloit, Kans., Concordia, Kans., Clay Center, Kans., Russell, Kans., Pratt, Kans., Burlington, Colo., Yuma, Colo., Fort Morgan, Colo., McCook, Nebr.

MARIE ENGLEMAN,

Chairman.

WAYNE I. MORAN,

Beloit, Kans.

DONALD J. FRECLUCHON,

Oberlin.

DEAN W. LARSON,

Concordia.

RALPH C. BETHELL,

Mayor, Hill City.

**RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF STATE OF NEW YORK**

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, sundry resolutions adopted by organizations of the State of New York. I ask unanimous

consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Appropriations:

**"RESOLUTION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TAXES AND GOVERNMENTAL ECONOMY**

"Whereas drastic reduction in the expenditures of the agencies of the Federal Government is the principal means whereby inflation can be curbed; and

"Whereas expenditures for domestic programs, meritorious though they may be, must, in good judgment, be limited if the United States of America must continue its vast expenditures for defense purposes and economic and military aid to allied and neutral countries throughout the world: Be it

*Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade call upon its representatives in the Congress to vote in opposition to any measures which would extend Federal expenditures beyond the limits imposed by the budget submitted to the Congress by the President.*

*"Adopted by the board of directors of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., meeting in session regularly assembled on this 7th day of April 1959."*

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembled on the 5th day of April 1959 at the Polish National Home in Manhattan, N. Y., the delegates of the 15th annual meeting of downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress, representing over 600,000 American citizens of Polish lineage, resolve the following:

"1. We hail with extreme pleasure the statement contained in President Eisenhower's declaration announced yesterday in historical Gettysburg, to the effect that there will be no so-called appeasement or capitulation to totalitarian communism in connection with the prevailing world situation and the critical issue of Berlin.

"2. We voice the gratification of Americans of Polish descent from downstate New York and welcome the stand adopted by the Department of State with regard to recognition of the Polish western frontier along the Oder and Neisse Rivers. We are happy to note that a similar and absolutely positive attitude to the same problem was expressed by the French President de Gaulle. We consequently endorse the decisions of the national executive body of the Polish American Congress who had submitted our joint demands in a memorandum to the Assistant Secretary of State Kohler and to Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on March 16, 1959. We are pleased to acknowledge that the many years' efforts and manifestations on the part of Americans of Polish descent affiliated with the Polish American Congress, who strove for recognition by the United States of the above-mentioned frontier are finally bearing fruit.

"3. We also fully endorse the request of the national Polish American Congress calling for adequate economic aid to the people of Poland by the United States. In particular, we join the declaration made by the national Polish American Congress which was unanimously approved at their meeting in Washington on March 17, 1959, and called for 'such an economic aid to Poland by the United States as would relieve the plight of the people of Poland and would enable them to at least partially improve their economic situation.'

"4. We call upon our members and on all Americans of Polish extraction to follow a straightforward course on the problem of aid to Poland and consequently urge them to continue sending individual relief parcels to

their nearest in Poland. This becomes imperative in the face of the recent decision by the American Relief for Poland organization and the latter's inability to carry on individual aid to the Poles in their native land. Individual relief should be continued until the situation of our countrymen in Poland is improved.

"5. Like the national Polish American Congress, we express our appreciation to the Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc., for its appropriate and, what is most important, its effective protection of Polish escapees against the arbitrary verdicts of deportation from the United States to Poland. Like the national Polish American Congress, we take this opportunity to pledge full support to the Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc., and we appeal to the large masses of Americans of Polish descent to lend full assistance to that institution which takes care of the Polish refugees and escapees and which deserves to be upheld.

"6. We reiterate the ideological principles professed by the Polish American Congress since its foundation 15 years ago in Buffalo. In particular, we call attention to the fact that apart from the subject of recognition of the Polish western frontier along the Oder and Neisse Rivers by the United States and the Western Powers, there remains the unfilled prerequisite of withdrawal of Soviet troops to prewar boundaries as of September 1, 1939, and restoration to Poland of her eastern lands robbed by Soviet Russia. There is also the unimplemented provision calling for free unfettered elections to be held in all the central and eastern European countries enslaved by Moscow, and finally non-admission of the present arrangement as being permanent in said countries, briefly—opposition to the stabilization of their present status quo spelling slavery.

"7. We assert jointly with all the Polish independence movement and the well-informed part of the American public that the Communist Party in Poland and the Warsaw regime established by them, in spite of its name of "People's Democracy" is neither a democracy nor does it represent the Polish people. Furthermore, we declare that in spite of the milder course adopted by the present regime in Poland as compared to the ruthless ruling methods of its predecessors during the Stalin era, it is still alien to the Polish people by its nature and its spirit. Hence, taking in consideration the existing state of affairs and with full understanding of the problem involved, we pay high tribute to the people of Poland who are forced to live under a foreign system imposed upon them, while they display a splendid spirit of unshakable loyalty to their true ideals.

"8. We express our firm belief that a stepped-up activity on the part of all individual members of the Polish American Congress toward a realization of our goals specified above, will strengthen our internal unity and resistance to the attempts of our totalitarian enemies in their endeavor to penetrate our ranks by means of the well-known method of infiltration, so as to undermine our peaceful existence. Our assembly feels that such an intensified activity of the Polish American Congress will contribute to bolstering of the U.S. defense against Communist aggression and will also increase our share of contribution to our common American heritage.

"Resolution committee:

"IGNATIUS MORAWSKI,

"Chairman.

"DR. LEOPOLD OBIEREK,

"JAN TRZASKA,

"Members.

"Convention officers:

"JUDGE WALTER J. BAYER,

"Chairman.

"WLADYSLAW BORZECKI,

"Secretary."

#### "WORLD COURT RESOLUTION"

"Whereas a determined effort is being made to induce the Senate of the United States to expand the powers of the World Court by vesting in the World Court the authority to decide what American cases before it constitute international disputes subject to the World Court jurisdiction and which cases are domestic in nature to be left for American courts; and

"Whereas the retention of the power to determine such vital questions by the American Government was a specific condition imposed by the Senate in accepting the jurisdiction of the World Court in purely international disputes; and

"Whereas the removal of such conditions by the Senate would seriously impair the sovereignty of the United States and vest in an essentially foreign tribunal a potential power over purely domestic matters involving the basic rights of American citizens should such foreign court so determine; and

"Whereas the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which is composed entirely of American citizens have been seriously attacked by American jurists of the highest stature as improper exercise of judicial power under the American Constitution indicating the tremendous possibilities of the invasion of the rights of American citizens through an excessive exercise of power by the World Court; and

"Whereas such impairment of American sovereignty can well serve as a stepping stone to complete world government by those groups endeavoring to propel the American Nation into such alien control: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the legislative committee of the Republican Committee of One Hundred hereby requests the Senate of the United States to reject emphatically all efforts aimed at impairing the sovereignty of the United States through abandoning the present power of the American Government to limit the jurisdiction of the World Court to purely international affairs.

"ELIZABETH S. COWLES,

"Legislative Chairman."

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

#### "RESOLUTION 37-D"

"Whereas an agency of our Federal Government has recently awarded a contract for a large steam turbine generator to a foreign firm; and

"Whereas many of the employees of the Schenectady plant of the General Electric Co. are residents of Rensselaer County; and

"Whereas the economy of the county and of all other areas adjacent to Schenectady have been adversely affected by the aforesaid award, and would be adversely affected by any future awards of this nature; and

"Whereas the defense effort and capability of our country will be deterred by any future awards of this nature: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That it is the opinion of the Rensselaer County Board of Supervisors that appropriate legislation be adopted whereby agencies of our Federal Government would be required to confine the award of contracts to domestic firms when such action will be to the best interests of the economy and defense of our country, and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Senator Jacob Javits, Senator Kenneth Keating, Congressman Dean P. Taylor, and Congressman Leo O'Brien."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTION 59: CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL PROJECTS URGED

"Whereas our future economic development and growth within the State and Nation depend in large measure on the con-

tinuous modernization and improvement of our connecting highway systems; and

"Whereas it now appears that a deficit of approximately \$241 million looms in the Federal highway trust fund, beginning July 1, 1959: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Congress be memorialized to face this critical financial situation affecting our Federal and interstate highway programs and take such action as to provide for a continuation of progress already made in this field, as well as to stimulate the economy in various economically depressed areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to our representatives in Congress."

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 1411. An act for the relief of T. V. Cashen (Rept. No. 208);

H.R. 2099. An act to provide for a posthumous cash award in recognition of the scientific contributions in the field of electronic ordnance made by the late Paul M. Tedder (Rept. No. 209);

H.R. 2975. An act to validate payments of certain quarters allowances made in good faith, and pursuant to agreements by authorized officials, to employees of the Department of the Navy, but which were subsequently determined to be inconsistent with applicable regulations (Rept. No. 210);

H.R. 4121. An act for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States, or their survivors, who were captured and held as prisoners of war in the Korean hostilities (Rept. No. 211); and

H.R. 4615. An act to relieve certain members and former members of the naval service of liability to reimburse the United States for the value of transportation requests erroneously furnished to them by the United States and for other purposes (Rept. No. 212).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, without amendment:

H.R. 4913. An act to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to lease buildings in the District of Columbia for its use (Rept. No. 213).

#### REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Department, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCGEE:

S. 1729. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of the estate of George E. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1731. A bill for the relief of Pacifico A. Tenorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 1732. A bill to approve a contract with the Conejos Water Conservancy District, Colo., to ratify its execution and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1733. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1734. A bill to amend section 409(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to presentations in any case of adjudication which has been designated for a hearing by the Federal Communications Commission;

S. 1735. A bill to repeal the honorarium provision in subsection (b) of section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1736. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission;

S. 1737. A bill to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields;

S. 1738. A bill to amend section 5(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to redefine the duties and functions of the review staff;

S. 1739. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to authorize the licensing of certain rebroadcasting stations constructed without a permit under such act;

S. 1740. A bill to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to expand the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section;

S. 1741. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the requirements for operating transmitting apparatus; and

S. 1742. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit certain practices in commerce by any manufacturer or producer who distributes his product in commerce through his own retail outlets, direct to consumers and also through other retail outlets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1743. A bill to promote an increasing flow of private capital from the United States into economically sound enterprises in other areas of the world, to enlist an ever-increasing number of individual private investors in this undertaking, to promote world peace through the expansion of mutual economic interests, to reduce gradually the need for U.S. foreign public investments and grants, to establish a World Development Corporation, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the third Monday in October of each year as Patriotic Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE:

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to amend section 84(a)(2) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MCGEE (for himself and Senators MANSFIELD, MOSS, HARTKE, MAGNUSON, CLARK, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HART, JAVITS, KENNEDY, RANDOLPH, MURRAY, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, SPARKMAN, HUMPHREY, YARBOROUGH, WILEY, KEFAUVER, MORSE, HENNING, CARROLL, YOUNG of OHIO, JORDAN, CANNON, McNAMARA, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and CHAVEZ) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) encouraging the development outside the continental United States of international educational programs, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MCGEE, which appears under a separate heading.)

### PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Federal Communications Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a series of nine bills to amend the Communications Act of 1934. I ask unanimous consent that the letters and explanations accompanying these bills may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation or letter accompanying each bill, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1733. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

(The explanation accompanying Senate bill 1733 is as follows:)

EXPLANATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO ITS SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 309(B) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED (47 U.S.C. 309(B))

Section 309(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 309(b)), requires in part that, before any application for a radio authorization is designated for a hearing, the Federal Communications Commission shall notify the applicant and other known parties in interest of the grounds and reasons why the Commission is unable to make the finding specified in subsection (a) of section 309 that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served by the grant of the application. Such notice must also advise the applicant and known parties in interest of all objections made to the application as well as the source and nature of the objections. The purpose of the notice is to afford the applicant an opportunity to correct deficiencies in his application and thus avoid the necessity for a hearing. Rarely does the response to the section 309(b) notice obviate the necessity for a hearing, and, in view of the impact of the notice requirement upon the processing of applications, the Commission urges that

the requirement for a prehearing notice be eliminated entirely.

As a result of the 309(b) notice requirement, each application which cannot be granted without hearing is processed at least twice: once completely in connection with the preparation of the 309(b) notice, and again at least in part when a reply is received from the applicant. The extent of the second processing will vary dependent upon the number of deficiencies cited in the notice and the nature of the amendments filed in response. The filing of a conflicting application between the time of issuing the section 309(b) notice and the reprocessing requires another 309(b) notice and an additional processing of the old application. A second 309(b) notice is also required if the reply or amendment induced by the first notice raises a new question. Thus, the requirement for a 309(b) notice, even if there are no further complications that require a second notice, adds at least 2 months to the time for processing an application, including the time spent in the preparation of the notice, the time for reply, the lag before the application is reached for reprocessing, and the actual reprocessing. If complications result from this delay, the processing time for the application is increased still more. In some cases as much as a year has elapsed between the issuance of the first 309(b) notice and the issuance of the hearing order. Indeed, the 309(b) notice requirement has been the largest single contributing factor in the buildup of the huge backlog of standard broadcast applications.

In many cases the only reason why an application cannot be granted without hearing is because a mutually exclusive application is pending. In many other cases the only reason is interference with an existing station or stations. In such cases, and in fact in most all cases, the applicant knows, or should know, the nature of the objections to his application, so that a 309(b) notice serves no useful purpose. Inasmuch as section 309(b) notices are now required in more than 80 percent of the standard broadcast applications, the impact upon the Commission's workload is apparent.

Thus, the Commission's proposed amendment eliminates the requirement in the statute for a prehearing notice to the applicant and known parties in interest before an application is designated for hearing but retains the present provisions of the statute that the hearing issues must be stated with particularity. Inasmuch as under the Commission's procedures an applicant may amend his application after designation for hearing and petition for reconsideration and grant without hearing, the deletion of the requirement of a prehearing notice would have little impact in those few cases where the reply to a prehearing notice would obviate the necessity for a hearing.

S. 1734. A bill to amend section 409(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to presentations in any case of adjudication which has been designated for a hearing by the Federal Communications Commission.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1734 is as follows:)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1959.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 86th Congress a proposal to amend section 409(c)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 409(c)(2)) to prohibit any person (except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law), directly or indirectly, from making a presentation to the commissioners unless upon

notice and opportunity for all parties to participate.

Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER,  
Chairman.

**EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 409(c)(2) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED (47 U.S.C. 409(c)(2))**

Under the provisions of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 409 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 409(c)(2)), in any case of adjudication which has been designated for a hearing by the Commission, no person who has participated in the presentation or preparation for presentation with respect to such case before an examiner or the Commission, and no member of the Office of the General Counsel, or the Office of the Chief Engineer, shall (except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law) make any additional presentation therein unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate.

The objective of the proposed amendment is to clarify the present section 409(c)(2) as it does not contain an explicit statutory prohibition against any other person, not identified as above, making a presentation to an examiner or a commissioner in such a case after it has been designated for a hearing; nor is there a specific statutory requirement that any such other person shall give notice of his presentation so as to afford an opportunity for all parties in the case to participate. The attached amendment is designed to correct these omissions in the statute.

The proposed amendment also provides that its terms shall not prevent consultations in such cases among the commissioners, their assistants, and the review staff.

S. 1735. A bill to repeal the honorarium provision in subsection (b) of section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1735 is as follows:)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1959.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 86th Congress a proposal to amend subsection (b) of section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 154(b)) to eliminate the provision under which a Commissioner may accept an honorarium for the presentation or delivery of publications or papers.

Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The considerations by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER, Chairman.

**EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SUBSECTION (B) OF SECTION 4 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, 47 UNITED STATES CODE 154 (B), 86TH CONGRESS**

The Communications Act Amendments, 1952, relaxed a prohibition against Commissioners engaging in any other business, vocation, profession, or employment by providing that this prohibition should not apply to the presentation or delivery of publications or papers for which a reasonable honorarium or compensation may be accepted. 47 U.S.C. 154(b). The Commission feels that the reasons which led to the adoption of this exemption are outweighed by the ambiguities as to its extent and coverage, and it accordingly recommends its repeal.

S. 1736. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1736, is as follows:)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1959.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 86th Congress a proposal to eliminate the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Commission as provided in sections 219, 308, and 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 219, 308, and 319).

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER,  
Chairman.

**EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, ELIMINATING THE REQUIREMENT OF AN OATH OR AFFIRMATION ON CERTAIN REPORTS AND APPLICATION FORMS SUBMITTED TO THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (47 U.S.C. 219, 308, AND 319)**

The Federal Communications Commission recommends to the Congress the consideration of legislation to amend sections 219, 308, and 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to eliminate the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain reports and application forms submitted to the Commission pursuant to said sections. Affected would be annual and other reports of common carriers required under section 219, and applications for construction permits, station licenses, or modifications or renewals thereof under sections 308 and 319.

As a substitute for the oath or affirmation on Commission forms, where presently re-

quired, it is proposed to provide thereon a warning similar to the following:

"Willful false statements on this form can be punished by fine or imprisonment. United States Code, title 18, section 1001."

Such section provides that whoever makes any false or fraudulent statements or representations concerning any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. In addition, the Communications Act provides in section 312(a) that a station license or construction permit may be revoked for false statements knowingly made in an application or in any statement of fact which may be required under section 308.

The requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain reports and application forms submitted to the Commission imposed a burden on the public, and also on the Commission in those instances where the applicant omits the required oath or affirmation. In such cases the workload of the Commission is increased to the extent necessary to return reports or application forms for the required verification. This slows up the consideration by the Commission of the matters involved and the processing of applications. Inconvenience and delay to the public result.

The Commission feels, therefore, that the elimination of the oath or affirmation requirements would not adversely affect its interest in view of the aforementioned provisions of the United States Code and the Communications Act, and accordingly urges the enactment of the proposed legislation.

S. 1737. A bill to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields.

(The explanation accompanying Senate bill 1737 is as follows:)

**EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TITLE V OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, TO AUTHORIZE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO IMPOSE FORFEITURES IN CASES OF VIOLATION OF CERTAIN RULES AND REGULATIONS BY RADIO STATIONS IN THE NONBROADCAST SERVICES**

The attached legislative proposal amends title V of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by adding at the end thereof a new section 508. Its purpose is to grant to the Federal Communications Commission authority to impose monetary forfeitures for violations of certain of its rules and regulations relating to radio stations in the common carrier and safety and special fields. This proposal also provides for remission or mitigation by the Commission of such forfeitures by an appropriate amendment to section 504(b) of the Communications Act. (47 U.S.C. 504(b).)

The need for this legislation is emphasized by the rapid and phenomenal expansion in the nonbroadcast radio service since World War II due in large measure to the development of new equipment and the utilization of new portions of the frequency spectrum. Many small companies have been licensed to operate radio stations as specialized common carriers; a still greater expansion has taken place in what are known as the safety and special radio services where radio is employed for numerous diverse purposes by large groups of users such as the maritime and aviation interests, police and fire departments, electric and gas companies, forestry agencies, taxicab companies, highway, truck, and bus companies, etc.

As of September 30, 1958, the number of radio stations (computed on the basis of call letters assigned) in the safety and special radio services alone had risen to 457,124. This represents an increase of several hundred percent over the stations which had



been authorized in these services as of June 30, 1946.

In the number of small boats equipped for radiotelephone communications, there has been an increase of approximately 400 percent (from 18,140 to 70,911) for the period 1949 to 1959. One of the most serious enforcement problems confronting the Commission results from the chaotic conditions existing on the small boat radiotelephone frequencies between 2 and 3 megacycles. In areas where there are concentrations of these boats, the misuse of the distress frequency has prevented the transmission of emergency messages to the Coast Guard. Normal enforcement methods such as issuances of rule violation notices and suspension of operator licenses have only been partially successful. During the first quarter of the fiscal year 1959, a total of 558 small boat radio stations were inspected. There were 371 violation notices issued as the result of noncompliance with the Commission's regulations. In addition, 159, or 28 percent, were found to be operating without authority from the Commission. Since inspection of 558 vessels is a very limited sampling of 70,000 boats licensed by the Commission, it is evident that disregard for the Commission's regulations is widespread. These statistics emphasize the inadequacy of the Commission's available enforcement tools in coping with this situation.

One result of the extensive increase in licensed stations in recent years has been a marked increase in the number of violations of the Commission's technical rules and regulations. This is particularly true in some of the newer private services where radio is not the principal activity of the licensee but is utilized as an adjunct to his primary business activities, and the station operators are accordingly less concerned with the necessity for adhering to the technical rules governing the use of radio. Most of the offenses are, taken individually, of a comparatively minor nature. Collectively, however, because of their number and variety they represent a very real menace to the orderly use of the radio spectrum and to efficient regulation by the Commission. In addition, these violations result in a serious menace to life and property in those services, such as maritime and aviation, where radio serves as a vital and necessary safety device.

The Commission has found that its existing sanctions are inadequate to handle the situation which confronts it. These existing sanctions, such as criminal penalties, revocation of licenses, and issuance of cease and desist orders, are normally too drastic for the relatively minor types of offenses involved, and too cumbersome and time-consuming considering the multitude of violations that occur. In aggravated cases these more drastic sanctions are, of course, available for use. However, the Commission is reluctant in any event to take action which will result in depriving a licensee of radio when it is being used for safety purposes, such as on an aircraft or a ship.

Congress has recognized the need for this type of forfeiture authority and has given it to various Government agencies. Thus, Congress has made a broad provision for civil penalties for violations of the Civil Aeronautics Act and certain regulations issued under that act (49 U.S.C. 62). And see, also, title 8, United States Code, section 1321 et seq. (aliens and nationality); title 46, United States Code, section 526 (o) and (p) (motorboats); title 49, United States Code, section 181(b) (aircraft); title 49, United States Code, section 322(h) (motor carriers); and title 49, United States Code, section 621 (inland waterways and air carriers). Moreover, Congress has already given such authority to the Federal Communications Commission, with respect to common carriers under title II of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and also as to those ships which

are required to carry radio equipment pursuant to the provisions of part II and part III of title III of that act. (47 U.S.C., 351-364 and 381-336.)

The proposal provides that forfeiture liability shall attach only for a willful, negligent, or repeated violation of the provisions enumerated in the new section 508 to be added to the Communications Act. It further fixes a maximum forfeiture liability of \$100 for the violation of the provisions of any one paragraph of the proposed section 508 and an overall maximum liability of \$500 for all violations of such section occurring within 90 days prior to the date a notice of apparent liability is sent. The Commission is required to give a notice of apparent liability to such person or send it to him by registered mail and to set forth therein facts which indicate apparent liability. The person so notified of apparent liability is given the right to show cause in writing why he should not be held liable and to request a personal interview with an official of the Commission at the field office of the Commission nearest to that person's place of residence.

Procedural safeguards are available to a person charged with forfeiture liability. Not only has he the right, under section 5(d) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 155(d)) to request a review of Commission action taken, but by the extension to the new proposal of the remission and mitigation provisions of section 504(b) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 504(b)) he is afforded a further opportunity to show cause why he should not be held liable. Should such person refuse to pay the amount of a forfeiture as finally determined, he could, by such refusal, cause the United States, if it so elects, to institute a civil suit against him, as provided in sec. 504(a) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 504(a)) thereby further contesting the validity of the asserted forfeiture liability. Thus, adequate safeguards would be available for the protection of the legal rights of a person against whom a forfeiture liability is asserted.

S. 1738. A bill to amend section 5(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to redefine the duties and functions of the review staff.

(The explanation accompanying Senate bill 1738 is as follows:)

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SUBSECTION (C) OF SECTION 5 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED (47 U.S.C. 155(c))

The purpose of the proposed amendment to section 5(c) of the Communications Act is to afford the Commission greater discretion in the utilization of the review staff provided for by that section. This would be accomplished without allowing recommendations to be made concerning the final disposition of any adjudicatory proceeding, for final decisions in adjudicatory matters would continue to be prepared in accordance with the specific directions of the Commission. The suggested changes to 5(c) would be accomplished by deleting the fourth sentence of the present section and substituting the proposed new language.

The principal advantage of the amendment would be to expedite the disposition of adjudicatory cases by permitting the professional staff of opinions and review to assist the Commission more fully than at present on those matters which do not involve final disposition thus allowing the Commissioners to concentrate their attention on the important questions of policy, law, and fact coming before them. This would be accomplished by permitting the review staff to advise the Commission on the disposition of interlocutory matters and to prepare legal and factual analysis for the Commission's assistance in all adjudicatory matters. In connection with the changes affecting inter-

locutory questions, it is believed that the amendment would be administratively beneficial by contributing to the more expeditious handling of these matters.

#### STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ROBERT T. BARTLEY

In my opinion, the Commission's proposal to amend section 5(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 would still limit the assistance of the review staff to a far greater degree than is either necessary or desirable. It should be borne in mind that this staff has the sole function of assisting the Commission in adjudicatory cases and that it is directly responsible to the Commissioners—it does not investigate, it does not prosecute. To deprive the Commission of the full assistance of which this staff is capable is both wasteful and inefficient. To permit this staff to assist the Commission fully in its decisional process would not in any way deprive any party to a case of any inherent right and could contribute to speedier action.

Therefore, I do not agree with the second sentence of the Commission's proposed bill.

#### STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER FREDERICK W. FORD

I believe that section 5(c) is unduly restrictive, unnecessary, and should be repealed. Section 5(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act relating to the separation of functions of the staff, contains all of the safeguards required.

S. 1739. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to authorize the licensing of certain rebroadcasting stations constructed without a permit under such act.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1739 is as follows:)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1959.  
Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and  
Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are aware, in numerous small communities and outlying areas beyond the direct range of television broadcast stations, television programs are made available to local residents by means of small low-powered repeaters. These devices, located at favorable reception points on hills or mountains, pick up television signals from distant stations, amplify them and retransmit them to nearby home receivers which are unable to obtain satisfactory direct reception.

Hitherto, the Commission, cognizant of certain potentials VHF repeaters have for interference to each other and for interference to other broadcast and nonbroadcast services, has confined the authorization of repeater devices to so-called translators operating in the UHF band. UHF translators offer several distinct advantages, both as to the limitation of interference and as to the range of useful service of good grade.

Prior to and during the pendency of lengthy proceedings devoted to a study of conditions under which it might be desirable to authorize repeaters in the VHF band, numerous VHF repeaters have been installed, without FCC authorization. The Commission has direct knowledge of over 300, and it has been estimated that the total number is substantially greater. In December 1958, the Commission announced the conclusion, to which it had come at that time, that the advantages of UHF translators so outweighed the considerations favoring the authorization of VHF repeaters, that it would be in the public interest to confine repeaters to the UHF band.

Since that time, however, the Commission has had the matter under continuing review, and has received additional field data which indicate that, under certain conditions, VHF

repeater operations may be conducted with less actual interference to other signals than had previously been calculated. Aware of the useful purpose served by these devices, and taking into account the investments made in those which have been installed, the Commission is now of the opinion that, if the Communications Act is appropriately amended, VHF repeaters could be licensed under conditions which will insure due protection to other users of the radio spectrum including aerial navigation services.

Under a longstanding construction by the Federal Communications Commission of section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which has been upheld by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the Commission is prohibited (with minor exceptions not relevant here) from authorizing the use of facilities for the broadcasting of signals by radio if such facilities were constructed prior to the grant of a construction permit therefor (WJIV, Inc., 231 F. 2d, 725; 97 U.S. Appeals D.C. 391).

Accordingly the Commission is separately recommending that section 319(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 be amended to permit the Commission to grant licenses to stations already constructed if they are engaged solely in rebroadcasting signals, if such stations were constructed on or before January 1, 1959, and if the Commission finds that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby.

In addition the Commission is separately recommending the amendment of section 318 of the act to clarify the statutory requirements concerning the operation of equipment (operator requirements) used for the broadcasting of signals by radio, including television repeater equipment. The text of the proposed amendments and accompanying explanations are enclosed with this letter.

Our study of the interference problem posed by the use of repeaters in the VHF band indicates the potential of interference to the following services: to other VHF repeaters, to the reception of TV programs by regular television broadcast stations operating in the VHF band, to FM radio broadcast stations, and to nonbroadcast services, such as public safety (police and forestry) services using frequencies between television channels 4 and 5 and to the operation of the aerial navigation services employing radio fan markers on 75 megacycles, also between channels 4 and 5. Taking all of these considerations into account the Commission believes that the following minimum requirements should be imposed upon the operation of VHF repeaters:

- (a) Transmission of the rebroadcast signals on a channel other than the channel on which the signal is received.
- (b) Maximum power output limited to no more than 1 watt.
- (c) Facilities for on and off remote control.
- (d) The selection of transmitting frequency, appropriate minimum mileage separation from cochannel transmitters of regular television broadcast stations (still to be determined), and such other operating conditions as may be needed to insure reasonable protection to regular broadcast and nonbroadcast services.

VHF repeaters would, in addition, come within the provisions of section 325(a) of the Communications Act requiring the permission of the originating station for the rebroadcast of programs.

In order to afford ample opportunity for the modification of existing VHF repeaters which do not at present meet the foregoing requirements the Commission contemplates allowing a reasonable period—up to 1 year—to bring existing VHF repeaters into conformity with these requirements.

Exceptionally, however, the Commission feels that in order to minimize any possible hazard to aerial navigation it is desirable

to take early steps toward the elimination of the operations on channels 4 and 5 of VHF repeaters or boosters which retransmit on the same channel as the incoming signal. The object would be to eliminate the possibility of such a VHF repeater receiving, amplifying, and transmitting signals of aerial fan markers operating on 75 megacycles, with the possible result that an aircraft pilot might be misled as to his true position. While the possibilities of this occurring appear relatively remote, and while it would require a combination of circumstances in addition to the retransmission of the fan marker signal to create a serious hazard, the Commission believes that the earliest possible elimination from channels 4 and 5 of VHF repeaters which transmit on the incoming frequency is highly desirable. Although our information is not complete, such data as are available indicate that probably fewer than 5 percent of all existing VHF repeaters would fall into this category.

If any additional comments or information are desired, would you kindly let us know? By direction of the Commission.

JOHN C. DOEFER,  
Chairman.

#### EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 319(D) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 (47 U.S.C. 319(d))

The development of television service throughout the United States has been hampered by the fact that in general the signals travel in a line of sight pattern. As a result, in mountainous terrain there are some valleys where a signal is not obtainable by ordinary home equipment and some of the communities are too small to support their own station.

The Commission has been endeavoring to work out a satisfactory plan for authorizing service to these isolated areas. In the meantime some communities have devised their own systems. Under the Communications Act of 1934, however, the Commission is prohibited from issuing licenses for facilities if those facilities have been constructed before the Commission granted a construction permit (47 U.S.C. 319(d)).

In addition to the engineering problems involved as to just what system would probably be best and therefore appropriately authorized, there were considerable doubts as to the legal authority of the Commission over small local facilities relaying signals from larger stations. Concurrently with the litigation testing the Commission's legal authority, the Commission was making an effort to work out a satisfactory plan for service to these smaller communities. Under these circumstances the Commission feels that a fair amount of liberality is indicated in permitting the authorization now of facilities constructed when the ultimate jurisdiction of the Commission and the terms under which it might grant licenses were in a state of flux.

Accordingly the Commission recommends that section 319(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 be amended to permit the Commission to grant licenses to stations already constructed if they are engaged solely in rebroadcasting signals, if such stations were constructed on or before January 1, 1959, and if the Commission finds that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby.

S. 1740. A bill to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to expand the Federal Communication Commission's regulatory authority under such section.

(The explanation accompanying Senate bill 1740 is as follows:)

#### EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 202(B) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED (47 U.S.C. 202(b))

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to give the Federal Communications Com-

mission legislative authority to regulate charges and services of common carriers for the use of microwave and other point-to-point radio circuits along with the use of wires in chain broadcasting or incidental to radio communication of any kind. The Commission's present authority in this respect is now confined by section 202(b) of the act to the use of wires for such purposes.

Since the enactment of the Communications Act in 1934, there have been technical developments in the use of microwave and other high frequencies that have led to the increasing use of point-to-point radio as a substitute for and a supplement to the use of wires in chain broadcasting. At the present time such point-to-point radio is widely used by common carriers in providing circuits for network broadcasting, studio-to-transmitter links, and remote pickup and control circuits for various types of radio stations. Had such facilities been perfected and in wide use in 1934 when the Communications Act was adopted, it is reasonable to believe that Congress would have included authority for their regulation also in subsection (b) of section 202 of that act. Said subsection (b) was a new provision in radio law that was incorporated in the Communications Act of 1934, "to make doubly sure that charges for wires in connection with chain broadcasting are within the jurisdiction of the Commission." (See the remarks of Representative RAYBURN in the House of Representatives on June 2, 1934, in opening the debate in the House on S. 3285, the Communications Act of 1934, 78 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10313.)

The Commission interpreted this section in 1936 in Capital City Telephone Co. (3 FCC 189) in connection with a claim of that company for exemption from certain regulatory requirements as a connecting carrier under section 2(b)(2) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 152(b)(2)). The company was at the time furnishing to a radio station certain wire lines for broadcasting purposes, which lines were located wholly within the State of Missouri. The Commission held that Congress, in enacting section 202(b), had clothed the Commission with jurisdiction over charges and services for wire lines used in chain broadcasting and other radio communication, even though the wires themselves were wholly within a State, since the complete transmission, wire and radio, was an interstate communication.

Although under section 202(b) it would appear that the Commission's jurisdiction in this field is limited to regulation of charges and services for the use of wires alone, certain carriers have continued to file tariffs with the Commission governing this service, whether by wire or radio. The proposed amendment will remove any question as to the Commission's regulatory authority over such charges insofar as radio facilities are concerned.

The proposed amendment is, therefore, recommended because of the increasing use of such radio facilities interchangeably with wire service in providing network service and control circuits furnished by common carriers to broadcasters and other radio users. It is further recommended as necessary and desirable because such amendment will give a clear statutory direction to the Federal Communications Commission of its responsibility in this field.

S. 1741. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the requirements for operating transmitting apparatus.

(The explanation accompanying Senate bill 1741 is as follows:)

#### EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 318 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED

The Communications Act of 1934, as amended, now provides in section 318 that the actual operation of transmitting equip-



ment licensed under the act should be carried on only by persons holding an operator's license issued under the act. The Commission is given discretion to waive that requirement except for certain named categories. In recent years the art of transmitting has advanced tremendously and the Commission believes that it should have greater statutory latitude as to the requirements for operators of transmitting equipment engaged in broadcasting. For instance, at present there may be an inference in section 318 that the operator be in personal attendance, whereas in some situations the Commission believes that it is enough for the operator to turn the equipment on, have it operated under his general control but not be in personal attendance. This situation is particularly true of transmitters engaged solely in rebroadcasting, such as the so-called boosters in smaller communities in mountainous terrain, especially out west.

Accordingly, the Commission recommends that section 318 of the Communications Act be amended to remove the explicit requirement that transmitting equipment of broadcast stations be operated by licensed operators.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT, RELATING TO PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES IN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit certain practices in commerce by any manufacturer or producer who distributes his product in commerce through his own retail outlets, direct to consumers and also through other retail outlets.

I am introducing this bill at the request of the National Federation of Independent Business. George J. Burger, vice president of the federation, advises me that a poll of the national membership of the federation, which comprises more than 125,000 independent establishments, showed that 86 percent favored this proposal, 11 percent opposed, 3 percent did not vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1742) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit certain practices in commerce by any manufacturer or producer who distributes his product in commerce through his own retail outlets, direct to consumers and also through other retail outlets, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PATRIOTIC EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the third Monday of October of each year as Patriotic Education Week. This joint resolution is a companion to House Joint Resolution 343, which was introduced in the House of Representatives on April 16 by the able Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of New Jersey, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 91) designating the 7-day period beginning on the third Monday in October of each year as Patriotic Education Week, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators MANSFIELD, MOSS, HARTKE, MAGNUSON, CLARK, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HART, JAVITS, KENNEDY, RANDOLPH, MURRAY, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, SPARKMAN, HUMPHREY, YARBOROUGH, WILEY, KEFAUVER, MORSE, HENNINGS, CARROLL, YOUNG of Ohio, JORDAN, CANNON, McNAMARA, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and CHAVEZ, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution, the purpose of which is to encourage the development of colleges and other technical institutions of higher learning outside the continental United States. Representative BYRON JOHNSON, of Colorado, is today submitting a similar concurrent resolution in the House of Representatives.

It has been our feeling that in our programs in the field of international education, while through the Fulbright program, the exchange of students, and other programs, we have greatly aided the understanding of people, we can do much more.

A good many of our students are reluctant to come back home after participating in such programs. They find studying abroad very much to their liking. On the other hand, the number of students who can be brought to the United States for technical training is obviously limited. We know, too, that the patience of the people of the world is not very great. For better or worse, they are moving rapidly. One of the best ways to grapple with the problem of human impatience is to speed up the educative process in their lands. For that reason, it is believed that if we could encourage, through the use of foreign currencies, and through the United Nations organization itself, the development in other countries, of institutions of higher learning, such as teachers' colleges, for example, we could facilitate the achievement of the end without too much disorder.

The foreign policy of the United States has for some time suffered criticism for being directed toward the maintenance of an unsatisfactory status quo. Administration measures have often seemed to be motivated only by the desire to "counterpunch." The dramatic changes which are taking place throughout the world have made this method bankrupt. It is not enough merely to counterpunch, and it is up to the majority in this session of Congress to provide the administration and the Nation with the new leadership which is so necessary if the United States is to play a constructive role in the great events of the future.

The McGee-Johnson concurrent resolution is an attempt to seize the initia-

tive in an especially critical area of world affairs. Its sponsors feel it has the following points in its favor:

First. It calls upon the United Nations to develop the detailed plan upon which this international education program would be built. In this way, it will be possible for the nations which make up this organization to work together, and the program developed will be free of the stigma of having been "Made in America."

Second. The concurrent resolution provides for the use of the inconvertible foreign currencies which are piling up in various countries of the world from appropriations made for other purposes. It should be possible to use these currencies for a constructive program, and their use would avoid, we hope, at least the immediate necessity for direct appropriations.

Third. The present method of bringing students from underdeveloped areas to study and receive training in this and other Western nations often fails in its purpose either because the student wishes to stay here when his training is completed, or because he has serious trouble adjusting to living and working conditions in his native country when he returns to put his training to use. These difficulties could be avoided by training the needed engineers, teachers, and other professional personnel required for these areas in regional schools closer to their homes.

Fourth. The presence of qualified technical and professional faculties in these areas, conducting and directing scholarly research, would provide a source of consultation and assistance on technical aid and other projects. It would also make possible a more objective and constructive appraisal of such things as project loan proposals.

Fifth. Since the areas of the world which do not now have adequate systems of primary and secondary education cannot be expected to develop them without large numbers of qualified teachers, and since these areas cannot be expected to develop strong economies without competent professional people in other fields, the time is now ripe for the development of an international educational program which is acceptable because sponsored and planned by the United Nations, and which is feasible because of the willingness of Congress to propose it and to accept a reasonable share of the cost of bringing it to fruition.

For these reasons, I submit the concurrent resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the desk through April 24, in order to give other Senators an opportunity to cosponsor it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States has benefited greatly from the exchange of students between our own country and other countries through the Fulbright Acts and Smith-Mundt Acts; and

Whereas, the other nations of the world have in recent years experienced remarkable growth in the number of persons trained

through the operations of these and similar programs; and

Whereas, increasing the level of education and attainment of the peoples of the world is the most productive investment that the nations of the world can make for the well-being of all mankind; and

Whereas, international educational programs enhance international understanding and thereby promote the cause of peace; and

Whereas, the cause of peace can be served by increasing cooperation among peoples of other nations in the pursuit of educational attainment; and

Whereas, many nations or regions of the world not now possessing universities, colleges and technical institutes are now on the threshold of readiness to create and operate such universities, colleges and technical institutes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby expresses its interest in encouraging the development outside continental United States of international educational programs, both graduate, including regional graduate schools, and undergraduate, including teachers colleges, technical institutes, as well as other colleges and universities; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the Congress hereby recommends that the U.S. Government encourage the United Nations Organization through its special fund or otherwise to undertake to develop a plan for international educational cooperation that would best serve the needs of the several member countries, as well as the cause of world peace and international economic and social development; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the Congress hereby expresses its willingness to accept a reasonable share of the cost of bringing into operation certain aspects of such a plan through the use of foreign currencies available for these uses, or otherwise as may prove suitable and desirable.*

#### LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill S. 1555 to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROUTY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1555, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HOLLAND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1555, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1555, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 1555, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

Senate bill 1555, as reported, permits the Secretary of Labor to exempt unions of less than 200 members and gross annual receipts of less than \$20,000 from its financial reporting requirements. Secretary of Labor Mitchell has opposed this exemption, pointing out that all union members should have governmental protection of union funds, regardless of whether they are part of a small or a large union.

The Secretary pointed out that in the disclosures of the McClellan committee "some of the very difficult problems" and "some of the messier situations arose in these small unions." He emphasized that some of the most corrupt unions, such as the Johnnie Dio paper locals, could, under some future Secretary of Labor, evade the financial reporting requirements.

The argument has been made that these reporting requirements would be burdensome to the smaller union; but the bill already contains a provision giving the Secretary of Labor ample authority to prescribe simplified reports for small unions and small employers where more detailed reports would be burdensome.

My amendment would close a significant loophole in the effective protection of union members and the general public. I believe all union members should be given equal treatment under the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

#### PAY AND CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM FOR EMPLOYEES OF SENATORS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 15, 1959, the name of Senator BUSH was added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 102) directing the Committee on Rules and Administration to report a pay and classification system for employees of Senators, submitted by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. HUMPHREY) on April 15, 1959.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE M. JOHNSON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN], I announce that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct a hearing on the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, vice Ernest J. Wilkins, deceased, to be a member of the Civil Rights Commission, at 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 21, 1959, in room 1202, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Public announcement of this hearing was made last week during the subcommittee's hearings on pending Federal civil rights legislation.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BILLS TO STRENGTHEN ANTISUBVERSIVE LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate that some of the most important legislative proposals which this Congress will consider will be the subject of hearings scheduled to begin today.

These are the 12 or more bills designed to strengthen antisubversive legislation, principally by remedying certain defects which the Supreme Court has indicated in a number of decisions during recent years.

As I have previously informed Senators, I have been asked by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman of the Judiciary Committee and of its Subcommittee on Internal Security, to preside over these hearings. I do not feel, therefore, that I should express my own views as to the language of any of these proposals.

However, I wish to point out to my colleagues that if the Congress desires, as it has so often indicated during the past two decades, to protect the Government of this Nation, and, indeed, the people of the United States, against the obvious efforts of the Communist conspiracy to destroy the one and enslave the other, as it has in the case of other nations and peoples, then it is necessary to make sure that the necessary legislation be adequate and effective. This I understand to be the purpose of the bills to be considered, and it certainly will be the purpose of the committee in conducting these hearings.

Preparation of legislation of this type and of this importance to the whole Nation is not, in my view, the responsibility of one Member or of one subcommittee or of one committee, but should be the result of consultation among all Members of the Congress, with the best advice that can be enlisted from students of the problems at issue.

It is for this purpose that I am drawing attention again today to the fact that hearings will begin at 1:30 p.m. today. They will be held in the Judiciary Committee chamber, room 2228, New Senate Office Building. In all probability, these hearings will run a week or 10 days; then we must close the record in order to get on with the legislative process.

The subcommittee is desirous of giving every consideration to the convenience of Senators and others who wish to testify on these bills and, therefore, would appreciate as much advance notice as possible. Prepared statements may be submitted at any time before the hearings are closed, but the Senate rules require that a witness who desires to testify from a prepared statement must submit the statement 24 hours in advance of his appearance.

This hearing will consider all anti-subversion legislation assigned to the subcommittee. The bills so assigned at this time are:

S. 3, by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and others, to establish rules of interpretation governing the effect of acts of Congress on State laws,



S. 294, by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and others, to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities.

S. 527, by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and others, to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section.

S. 1646, by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], relating to espionage and censorship.

Also the several bills introduced by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] to carry into effect recommendations of the American Bar Association for strengthening antismuggling legislation:

S. 1299, to protect the effectiveness of State antismuggling laws against unintended Federal preemption.

S. 1300, to define the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act.

S. 1301, to make full disclosure respecting loyalty to the United States a condition of Government employment.

S. 1302, to amend sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide protection against the subversive activities of certain aliens.

S. 1303, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to travel in time of war or national emergency and passport procedures.

S. 1304, to broaden the application of the Summary Suspension Act of 1950.

S. 1305, to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to make it a crime intentionally to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States or to teach the necessity, desirability, or duty of seeking to bring about such overthrow.

And the following bills which have passed the House:

H.R. 1992, to repeal section 791 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend the application of chapter 37, title 18, relating to espionage and censorship.

H.R. 2369, to define "organize" as used in the Smith Act.

#### NEEDED: A SOMETHING-FOR-SOMETHING PROGRAM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the 86th Congress has been in session for a little more than 3 months. In that time, on three occasions, we have faced clear-cut decisions on matters affecting the Federal budget—the housing bill, the airports bill, and the depressed areas bill.

The paramount domestic issue of the day involves the Federal budget. It is discouraging to observe, therefore, that on these three major tests thus far, the Congress has gone beyond the spending requests of the administration and has upset the proposed balanced budget.

The importance of greater fiscal responsibility in these times cannot be overemphasized. In all my nearly 23 years as a U.S. Senator, there has never been a time such as today when the need for such responsibility has been so great.

#### THE FALSE SOMETHING-FOR-NOTHING THEORY

The basic problem before us here in the United States—as around the world—is the false fancy that government can give its individual citizens vast benefits at little or no cost.

This is the something-for-nothing theory. It takes the form of demands that every legislator bring home more than his State sent to Washington in the form of taxes.

There is a growing awareness among the public, I believe, that this something-for-nothing theory is a hollow one.

More and more people realize that mounting government costs will result either in a crushing burden of direct taxes or, if legislators are unwilling to impose the necessary direct taxes, in the more insidious indirect tax of inflation via deficit financing.

It is increasingly hazardous for those who believe in spending and more spending to ridicule the administration's attempts to keep Federal revenues within shouting distance of Federal expenditures.

Something for nothing is neither good mathematics nor good morals. I believe the time is fast approaching when it is not good politics either.

#### "ROBBING PAUL TO PAY PAUL"

Apparently, we shall soon be asked to vote for Federal aid to education, because, the argument runs, "poor" people in rural areas cannot stand the cost of good schools, and must have help from urban areas such as Detroit, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles.

But we have just finished passing bills for Federal aid for airports, urban renewal, and depressed areas to help such cities as, apparently, the same Detroit, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles, and others which are too "poor" to pay this cost, which now will be paid by the suddenly better-off farmers and small town citizens from the rural areas.

When the process is complete, and everyone gets through paying for what the Government has done for everyone else, we will face a rising tax burden or a widening deficit, or both.

In other words, it is quite clear that we very quickly exhaust the possibilities of robbing Peter to pay Paul, and end up robbing Paul to pay Paul.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE IS LOSER

The State of New Hampshire is a consistent loser in this futile process.

Under most education proposals—and I use this only as an example—we would be taxed more than the benefits we would receive. For example, under one important education proposal, New Hampshire would, in effect, be taxed by about \$531,000 a year more than the amount of Federal benefits we would receive.

Under the depressed areas proposal, we would pay for subsidies designed to lure away our own industries to other areas. There are no depressed areas whatever in the State of New Hampshire, I am happy to say.

We have little stake in urban renewal, slum clearance, or public housing. But with all our sister States we would have

to help foot the bill of Federal programs in these and other fields.

We in New Hampshire are vitally concerned with human needs both within our State and throughout the country. But let us meet these needs as they come up, at the level of responsibility closest to the need—whether it be through individuals or private enterprise or local or State governments.

Let us not assume that the existence of a need automatically produces a responsibility of the Federal Government. Often that responsibility is best met by some other agency.

The Federal Treasury has no mysterious pipeline to some inexhaustible flow of funds from the moon.

Federal welfare measures must be paid in one way or another—either by direct taxes or by the subtle but cruel indirect tax of inflation which results when we spend, but fail to tax ourselves sufficiently, and thus resort to deficits.

Government has no magic resources. It can furnish people only what it has first taken away from people.

In short, there is no such thing as something for nothing.

The degree to which we have let ourselves think that human welfare can be met only by steadily rising drains on the U.S. Treasury—which means the American public—is remarkable.

#### THE GROWTH OF SOCIAL WELFARE

The Roosevelt administration in its first two terms spent a great deal of money on social welfare, but these expenditures were modest indeed when placed alongside the amounts flowing out in more recent years.

In 1935, Federal outlays for welfare programs were only \$2 billion. Even by 1945, at the end of the war, annual welfare expenditures were only \$2,272 million. But in 1950 the dollar figure rose to nearly \$7 billion—a threefold increase in 5 years. By 1955, we were spending \$12 billion on social welfare programs. In the year just concluded, the total had continued its dizzying ascent to \$18 billion. In 1960, according to budget estimates, Federal social welfare spending will top \$21 billion.

The rising tide of social welfare expenditures is shocking because it has taken place in the full prosperity of these postwar years.

In the face of record levels of production and income, improved well-being for all our people, and expanding capacity of individuals to meet their own needs, there can be no justification for such a meteoric rise in Government welfare programs.

#### FACTS WHICH STARTLE TAXPAYERS

If \$10 million had been paid out each year from the birth of Christ down through the ages to 1960, less money would have been paid out than will be paid out this year alone.

In 1 year we are spending more on Federal welfare programs than on the purchase of aircraft, missiles, ships, and other military equipment for the Defense Department.

We are spending four times as much on Federal welfare programs as we are

spending for research and development which are so vital to our national security and strength.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table which shows the rising levels of Federal social welfare expenditures.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Millions of dollars]

Year	Total	Direct payments	Welfare agencies
1935.....	2,942	2,863	79
1940.....	3,195	2,976	219
1945.....	2,272	1,814	458
1950.....	6,994	5,040	1,954
1955.....	12,210	10,421	1,789
1960 (estimated).....	21,546	18,939	2,607

#### EXPENSES DOUBLED SINCE 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, of course, we all recognize that the depression of the thirties generated a great expansion in the role of the Federal Government. We know that World War II required huge outlays in Federal funds.

But it is surprising to note that since 1950, the expenditures of the Federal Government have literally doubled again.

In the fiscal year 1950, Federal budget expenditures were \$39,617,000,000. In the current fiscal year, less than 10 years later, Federal budget expenditures are estimated at \$80,871,000,000.

If the efforts of the administration are not frustrated by overzealous spenders, the present level may be somewhat reduced in the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table which shows the rise in Federal budget expenditures since World War II.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### Federal budget expenditures, 1946-59

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total	Major national security	Other
1946.....	60,448	43,207	17,241
1947.....	39,032	14,372	24,660
1948.....	33,069	11,771	22,298
1949.....	39,507	12,907	26,600
1950.....	39,617	13,009	26,608
1951.....	44,058	22,444	21,614
1952.....	65,408	43,976	21,432
1953.....	74,274	50,363	23,911
1954.....	67,772	46,904	20,868
1955.....	64,570	40,626	23,944
1956.....	66,540	40,641	25,899
1957.....	69,433	43,270	26,163
1958.....	71,936	44,142	27,794
1959.....	80,871	46,120	34,751

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the ideas for new spending proposals continue to pour forth.

Last year, congressional action led to a veto by the President of an airports bill of \$437 million, a depressed areas bill of \$280 million, and a rivers and harbors bill of \$191 million.

This year in the Senate we have already passed a \$465 million airports bill, a \$390 million depressed areas bill, and

a housing bill which exceeds by more than \$1 billion the administration's determination of housing needs.

More legislation is waiting in the wings—a multibillion dollar education program, for example, a \$1 billion community facilities bill, and others.

#### THE ARGUMENTS FOR SPENDING

Those who adhere to the "something-for-nothing" theory advance a barrage of arguments to justify their position. Most of these arguments are transparent and are easily recognized for what they are. I should like to single out three specific arguments which we often hear:

First. That we must raise Federal spending, to promote more rapid economic growth.

Second. That we must raise Federal spending because a strong defense is more important than a balanced budget.

Third. That we must raise Federal spending because, after all, most of the programs under consideration will not affect this year's budget or the budget for fiscal year 1960.

These are arguments which have a somewhat plausible, but shallow, ring. Indeed, most of those who make these arguments, I am sure, do so in all sincerity.

#### WHY ARGUMENTS DO NOT HOLD WATER

In my judgment, however, these are not valid arguments; and I intend to show why.

First, there is the argument that we must raise Federal spending, to promote more rapid economic growth.

Of course, I am in favor of economic growth. I know of no Senator who is not proud of the vigorous economic growth for which America is famous. Our free economic system has made possible a great rise in living standards for the many.

But I want our growth to continue in terms of real productive power, and not simply in terms of more money spending and inflation. The growth of the United States should be a vast broadening and deepening of the economic base, a general lifting of living standards—not a hothouse inflationary spurt which cannot be sustained.

If we want real economic growth, let us recognize that it is going to come from private-capital formation, investment in new and more efficient work-saving machines, and more productive organization of labor. Simply spending more at the Federal Government level may raise total output on a one-shot basis, but it will not accelerate economic growth.

It is pointless to try by artificial means to force a progress that is really hindered by the very means to which we are asked to turn.

#### EXAMPLE OF THE THEATER SEAT CUSHIONS

In effect, such spending measures—now for one purpose, now for another—constitute a hurried attempt to supply cushions to a few in the theater so they can see over the heads of the people in front of them, and then, to supply more cushions to the people in back of them. But this scheme can look pretty dubious when everyone is supplied with a cushion.

Second, there is the argument that a strong defense is more important than a balanced budget.

This is a false issue. Of course, national security is more important than any other objective. But if we need to spend more on national security, then we can afford to pay the full cost in direct taxes. The alternative is to pay the price in the hidden tax of inflation—the cruelest, most regressive of government taxes. If we want to balance the budget, we must do so at whatever level is dictated by the needs of the times—the real needs, not all the fancied needs and inflated demands on the Treasury which every special pleader may think of.

Some of those who would jack up defense spending overnight show no genuine understanding of defense problems. They would have us spend billions on some types of missiles which could be outmoded overnight by the advance of military technology even before production was fully completed. In modern preparedness, one of the first requirements is to keep up with the rapid pace of weapons research. Billions spent on arms which will be obsolete in a matter of months are billions wasted.

#### NO CONFLICT BETWEEN BALANCED BUDGET AND DEFENSE

There is no conflict between a balanced budget and adequate national security. The American people can afford adequate national security. The American people can face up to their own defense needs, whatever they may be; but the American people can also face up to the need for fiscal responsibility at a time of rising prosperity. In fact, I believe that the American people will insist that our political leaders face up to the requirements of fiscal integrity—which at this time means a balanced budget.

There can be no real national security without fiscal stability.

Our need is for a modern and ready defense—strong in defense of our homeland, and strong in the power to retaliate against any aggressor.

The administration's defense budget was designed to represent what we need for adequate national security. It is also consistent with a balanced over-all Federal budget. There is no conflict between these objectives. On the contrary, they are mutually complementary objectives; one is essential to the other.

#### THE DISTURBING ARGUMENT ADVANCED BY SPENDERS

Finally, the most disturbing argument now gaining currency is that we should pay no attention to Federal spending programs if they do not directly affect this year's budget or the budget for fiscal year 1960.

Let us take a close look at this argument.

Earlier in the year we considered urban renewal legislation. We were confronted with many proposals for committing the Federal Government to literally billions of dollars for 6-year or 10-year programs. In these proposals, actual spending would not have taken place, in some cases, for from 15 to 20 years.



Yet some proponents actually contended that because these proposals did not involve spending in this fiscal year, we did not need to consider the impact on the budget. The argument was made that the need for fiscal restraint did not apply to these proposals.

Mr. President, I am not against urban renewal, per se. But if urban renewal spending is worthwhile, we should be quite willing to tax ourselves for the full cost. If we are going to undertake such vast programs, we should be willing to face up to the costs.

Last year, when the President vetoed an area redevelopment bill, the claim was made that the administration could not object to the dollars involved because they had not yet been appropriated.

The irony is that when we start paying these multi-billion-dollar bills 2 or 3 or 5 or 10 years hence, all of the same proponents will stand around and will say, "We can't cut the budget here. The money was committed years ago. There is nothing we can do about it now."

In other words, the argument is that we should ignore the budgetary impact of these delayed spending programs now—and we should also ignore their budgetary impact later. In brief, this means we would never face up to the cost of these programs.

There are in the 1959 budget and in the 1960 budget, spending items which flow out of legislation passed in earlier years.

Does anyone suggest that now, when the money is being paid out, we should go back and should reconsider the legislation enacted by an earlier Congress, and perhaps should repeal or alter it? Hardly.

The time to weigh the merits and demerits of any proposal for Federal spending is, primarily, at the time when the basic legislation is being considered. It is obvious which time is more feasible. It is next to impossible to discuss fully the pros and cons of spending on a program which is set up and running. The time to consider the pros and cons is when we set up any new program. That is the time to weigh fully and wisely the benefits and costs of any new programs. If we really believe that the benefits outweigh the costs, why should we fear a close look at the costs as well as the benefits?

#### A FOUR-POINT SOMETHING-FOR-SOMETHING PROGRAM

Mr. President, I propose a four-point something-for-something program. I propose that we specifically reject the theory of something-for-nothing. I propose that we pursue, instead, the far more rewarding, more genuine course of something-for-something. I think this is what the American people want.

First, let us frankly acknowledge that the Federal Government is not financially ready to underwrite any and all welfare measures which the minds of 98 Senators and 436 Members of the House of Representatives may dream up. We have limited resources. Existing sources of revenue do not provide us with any surplus with which to launch vast new programs. This is obviously not the

time to pile new taxes on the burden already imposed on our people, nor is it the time to run a deficit, just as the economy is surging forward in a wave of expansion. So let us face the fact that Federal resources are limited.

Second, let us, then, recognize that we can undertake Federal spending only for items which clearly yield benefits that outweigh the costs. We must undertake items only of the highest priority.

Third, let us stop the efforts to sneak through vast spending measures without due consideration to the costs involved, in an effort to make political "quick tricks." We cannot continue to punch holes in the administration's narrowly balanced budget and siphon off \$465 million here, \$2.7 billion there, and \$390 million there. We must stop committing ourselves for dollars we have not got, for things we do not need or for things which ought to be paid for by those who use them, through the free market mechanism.

Fourth, and finally, let us reconstruct our thinking on a something-for-something basis.

We need to recognize that we cannot undertake new programs without cost, expecting some theoretical few to foot the bill.

Instead, we must have bold, forward-looking public policies.

This is the only soundly rewarding course, as well as the only one which serves the interests of the many, and to which the great majority of our people will give their full support.

Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire.

#### NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on October 24, last year, President Eisenhower sent to the Senate the nomination of the Honorable Lewis L. Strauss to serve as our Secretary of Commerce.

The selection of Mr. Strauss was warmly approved by our people throughout the country. There was no question of the intent of the overwhelming membership of the Senate. It was to confirm Mr. Strauss' appointment with the due deliberation and dignity befitting his high qualifications and his already brilliant record in behalf of our Nation.

Mr. Strauss' entire life is a record of patriotism and devotion to the security and progress of America.

He began public service as an assistant to Herbert Hoover, in World War I. He possesses a total service of 32 years as an officer in the Naval Reserve, retiring with the rank of rear admiral.

Mr. Strauss has served in assignments of great importance under three Presidents, and all three have praised his great ability and dedication in carrying forward the duties placed upon him.

#### TWO MOMENTOUS DECISIONS

He was a special assistant in the Navy Department, under Mr. Roosevelt. He was appointed by Mr. Truman to be a member of the first Atomic Energy Commission; and in the period that followed, Mr. Strauss brought about two momen-

tous decisions that proved vital to the security of the United States. The first was the establishment of the long-range detection system which first warned us, in 1949, that the Soviet Union had achieved atomic-weapon capability.

The second was our determination to go ahead with the development of workable hydrogen bombs. He fought for the latter decision, in the face of very great opposition. Looking back, now, at the Soviet Union's rapid progress in this field, the American people know that our early movement into hydrogen weapons has preserved peace in the world.

In more recent years, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, under President Eisenhower, Mr. Strauss has made historic contributions both to our security and to the peaceful use of atoms for the advancement of mankind.

His many other responses to calls for unselfish public service, his long background of business experience, and his deep integrity are well known to the Senate and to the American people.

In view of all these facts, I have been shocked and saddened more than I can say by the manner in which action to confirm his appointment has been conducted.

I think it unnecessary to state that I have always held deep respect for the way in which the U.S. Senate carries on its business. The traditional honor and dignity and probity of this body are sources of great pride and great inspiration.

#### HIGHLY DECORATED

I am definitely disturbed in the action of those who have been party to delaying the confirmation of this Cabinet appointment for months; and particularly concerning a man who in 1948 was awarded the Medal of Freedom; who holds the Navy Distinguished Service Medal; who has been awarded the Legion of Merit, and a Gold Star in place of a second award, and the Army's Oak Leaf Cluster in place of a third medal—these among other decorations.

It is a perfectly legitimate and necessary function of the Senate to inquire into the experience, the record and basic opinions of men nominated to high public office. But we should not let this deteriorate into a campaign to impugn the proven integrity of a distinguished citizen, or to embarrass and harass him.

#### ACTION NOW, NECESSARY AND VITAL

It is highly important that action be taken in the Strauss nomination, not alone for the dignity of the Senate, but so that fair treatment will be accorded Mr. Strauss in reasonably quick time.

It is important because our Nation is engaged in a critical economic war declared upon us by the Communist leadership. The Department of Commerce must play a vital part in maintaining our supremacy in this conflict.

Lewis Strauss has demonstrated amply his deep awareness and understanding of the Communist threat, and, more important, his ability to generate effective measures to deal with it.

He must be permitted, at once, to enter into this great, challenging task without

harassment, and with the renewed assurance of the full confidence of the American people as expressed in the confidence and cooperation of the Senate.

Let us meet our responsibility.

Let us proceed promptly to confirm the President's nomination of Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce, and wish him Godspeed in his work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator from New Hampshire tell me what the status of the nomination is? Is it still in committee?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is still in committee and still being considered by the committee, and has been for some time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope the committee will see fit to report the nomination to the Senate, recommending the confirmation of the nomination, because as one Senator, I am ready to vote for him right now.

Mr. BRIDGES. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has said. I think that the action of the committee on the nomination should be speedily reported and action taken by the Senate.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning on the Senate floor the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] made some remarks for the RECORD with reference to the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Strauss. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire in that regard. It is my hope that expedited hearings on this important nomination will be had.

The hearings will start tomorrow morning at 10:30, and I hope they will be expedited.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am happy to hear what the distinguished Senator from Kansas has said about the hearings starting tomorrow morning, and his expectation that the hearings will be expedited.

The Senator from Kansas is one of the most able and forthright Members of this body, and his observation on this subject is reassuring. Does the Senator from Kansas have any idea as to exactly when we may expect action?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Since we have a positive date set for the hearings with regard to the nomination of Admiral Strauss, which will start tomorrow morning at 10:30, I am hopeful that, consistent with the work in the Senate, there will be expedited consideration. Certainly that is the hope of the minority, and I have every reason to believe it is the hope of many Members of the majority.

Mr. BRIDGES. This morning I was very happy to hear the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] join with the Senator from New Hampshire in urging early and favorable action on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Strauss. I have also been

told, informally, of similar expressions on the part of many distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle. I sincerely hope the committee will take action soon, that they will report the nomination favorably, and that the Senate will soon have an opportunity to vote for confirmation.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Certainly it will be the responsibility and the desire of the Senator from Kansas to do everything possible to expedite the hearings.

#### WAGE NEGOTIATIONS IN THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, wage negotiations in the steel industry this summer are fraught with implications for the public interest. Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, has announced that he intends to demand a \$1 billion wage increase from the steel companies. The inflationary potential of such a demand is not hard to see.

We have long ago learned that massive wage increases in an industry like steel do not come out of profits. Instead, to the extent that wage increases outrun productivity improvements, the added cost is reflected in higher prices for steel and for the multitude of products in which steel is an important component.

Furthermore, it is well known that steel wage negotiations serve as the pattern for similar if not identical increases in many other industries.

No one is against wage increases—wage increases which can be paid out of the great technological advances and improvements in productivity which American industry generates each year—but when highly powerful unions are in a position to negotiate wage increases which far exceed such improvements, no one gains anything.

The result is simply inflation, with its ruinous effects on those least able to protect themselves, and ultimately with adverse effects on the purchasing power of the wages of steelworkers themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star on April 13. This editorial sheds light on one important ramification of the forthcoming steel negotiations. It points out that, if Mr. McDonald failed to use his enormous power to secure a hefty wage increase, he would lose favor with the membership.

And he would be succeeded by someone who would be demanding a two-billion instead of a one-billion package.

The problem, then, is the power which now lies in the hands of unions such as the United Steelworkers. The remedy must come through legislation. In short, it is the responsibility of Congress.

As the Evening Star points out:

But when this country embarked a little more than 2 decades ago on its program to build up and strengthen the unions it succeeded beyond expectations. It created the most powerful single mechanism in our economy, a mechanism which survives only by demanding—and getting—an ever-larger slice of the total pie. The Government created this mechanism and only the Government can restrain it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STEEL INDUSTRY APPEAL

Assuming its good faith, which may be assuming too much, the steel industry's no-wage-boost appeal ignores one of the salient facts of union political life. And this, simply stated, is that David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, would put his neck in the noose if he agreed to abandon higher wage demands for the coming year. Mr. McDonald is not going to hang himself in this fashion, and the steel industry knows it.

Why can't Mr. McDonald forgo a wage increase? The steelworkers are among the highest paid in the country. Although the industry is operating at near capacity many steelworkers are unemployed. High costs and foreign competition threaten the jobs of still more union members. Yet the union is talking about a billion dollar hike in the wage package. We do not believe that this makes sense from any point of view. Yet Mr. McDonald rejects the industry appeal "out of hand," and serves notice that wage demands will be pressed.

The reason, or at least one important reason, is obvious enough. Two years ago Mr. McDonald was up for reelection as union president. An unknown opponent came charging out of nowhere to challenge him, the challenge being predicated on a promise to get more for the steelworkers. To everyone's amazement, this challenger received about one-third of the vote. If Mr. McDonald, especially in response to an industry appeal, were to drop his wage demands he would be signing his own death warrant as union president. And he would be succeeded by someone who would be demanding a two-billion instead of a one-billion package.

This is a fact of union life which is ignored by the industry's appeal and by such things as Mr. Eisenhower's exhortations to hold the line. In the interest of the Nation, the line ought to be held—there is no doubt on that score. But when this country embarked a little more than two decades ago on its program to build up and strengthen the unions it succeeded beyond expectations. It created the most powerful single mechanism in our economy, a mechanism which survives only by demanding—and getting—an ever-larger slice of the total pie. The Government created this mechanism and only the Government can restrain it. There is no use appealing to the Mr. McDonalds of the union movement. Even if they wanted to, they couldn't apply the brakes and still survive.

#### HOW FAST "SHOULD" THE UNITED STATES GROW?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in Fortune magazine for April 1959. The editorial is entitled, "How Fast 'Should' the United States Grow?"

Mr. President, the subject of economic growth has been widely discussed in recent months.

In this country we have enjoyed a fabulous growth in productive capacity and in living standards for all our people. I believe that in much of the recent discussions of growth, we tend to forget what the basis of the great economic growth which we have experienced in the



past is, namely, the vigor of our free-enterprise system.

As this Fortune editorial points out, many advocates of more and more Government spending are arguing that we should try to achieve a rate of economic growth of 5 percent a year. The Fortune editorial points out:

The major defect of the 5 percent dogma, by contrast, is that it would defeat its own ends by trying to do too much too soon.

The trouble with the 5 percenters' case is not that too much growth is harmful; quite the contrary is true. The more our productive capacity expands, the better able we are to meet our defense requirements and still enjoy a high and rising standard of living.

The trouble with the 5 percenters' case is not in the goal but the means. More Government spending will not necessarily expand our economic pace; it could merely divert our growth from private to public spending.

To get more rapid economic growth, we need to encourage more private capital formation. We need to accelerate industrial technology. We need inducements for massive investment in new machines and equipment by private industry.

Mr. President, I am confident that in the future we will continue to enjoy great economic gains as we have in the past.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HOW FAST "SHOULD" THE UNITED STATES GROW?

As Soviet power and audacity mount and the cold war warms up to yet another boiling point in Berlin, the growth potential of the American economy is seen more clearly than ever as one of the controlling forces of world politics. The expansion of the U.S. economy, precisely because of the much publicized (if much exaggerated) expansion of the Soviet economy, is not merely a warm subject among marketing men and economists but a burning public issue. So great are the dynamics of growth that a single percentage point in the U.S. growth rate can make a \$75 billion difference, 10 years from now, in the country's economic and military power.

From the fog of argument about how fast the U.S. economy can—or should—grow, there have emerged several distinct points of view, the most sensational of which is what might be called the 5 percent school of thought. This school has looked at all "the things that must be done"—the rising needs of defense, education, roads, health, the reduction of unemployment, etc.—and has come to the conclusion that the needs can be met only if the U.S. economy expands at 5 percent a year. Probably the most articulate of the new five percenters is Leon Keyserling, Chairman of the Council on Economic Advisers under Harry Truman. But the 5 percent doctrine also turns up with increasing regularity in the rhetoric of union leaders and Democratic Congressmen. And the Republicans are not immune to its heady appeal. One of the premises of last year's Rockefeller Report on the future of the U.S. economy was that the country ought to grow by 5 percent a year.

At the other end of the spectrum is a school that is allowing itself to be labeled "3 percenters." The 3 percenters include a number of bankers and businessmen and some economists. Their leader, to judge

from some of his comments on economics, is none other than the President. These generally conservative people correctly identify 5 percent with galloping inflation, and in several other respects have a good deal of wisdom on their side.

Their great error, however, is that they so often accept debate on just the terms that the 5 percenters wish, as though the only alternative to a forced 5 percent was a natural 3 percent. It is true that the long-term growth rate of the U.S. economy, averaged out over the past 50 years, has been about 3 percent. But a more significant fact is that the postwar growth rate of the U.S. economy has averaged almost 4 percent. And the postwar period, which now extends over 13 years, can no longer be dismissed as some brief aberration.

#### THE POWER OF 4.25

Elsewhere in this issue "The Good Uses of \$750 Billion," page 104, Fortune argues that the U.S. economy can grow by a little more than 4 percent a year during the 1960's, or by 50 percent for the decade as a whole. These figures were not pulled out of a hat. The growth of any country's total production is a function of its labor force and productivity. Because the U.S. labor force will be growing faster in the 1960's than it has in several decades, man-hours worked can increase at about 1.25 percent a year—despite a shorter workweek and "frictional" unemployment. Productivity has been rising at 3 percent a year since World War II, and in the coming age of research and automation, should do at least as well. All this should add up to a national growth rate of 4.25 percent a year.

The United States that emerges from such an analysis is a land of colossal attainments and potentialities; college enrollments will increase by 50 percent by the end of the decade, with nearly half the young people of college age in college (only a third of the youth in the Soviet Union finish 10 years of school). Just by 1965 the country could increase its defense effort by about 25 percent, capital investment by about 50 percent, and consumption by about 20 percent. The U.S. economy, in short, is in a position to assume enormous military and investment burdens and still provide a swiftly rising standard of living.

#### TOO MUCH TOO SOON

The major defect of the 5 percent dogma, by contrast, is that it would defeat its own ends by trying to do too much too soon. The Five Percenters do not propose to squeeze any more man-hours out of the labor force than the 1.25 percent a year increase already projected. Thus the only way they can raise the country's overall growth rate to 5 percent is to force the rate of productivity increase up from the 3 percent that seems to be assured to the unnaturally high rate of 4 percent. And how could this be accomplished? Only by Government policies that would encourage (and subsidize) a vastly higher rate of capital investment than normal market considerations dictate.

Since normal market forces already promise a very high level of capital investment in the 1960's, a Government effort to jack up this level by as much as one-third would put a very heavy burden on consumption. Even if GNP expands by only 4 or 4.2 percent a year, the country's capital needs, as the accompanying article points out, will retard the growth of consumption for a few years. But if GNP is to expand at 5 percent, consumption per capita could be allowed no rise during the next 3 or 4 years. Such a totalitarian-style distortion of balanced growth probably could be achieved by sacrificing the incentives that stimulate natural balanced growth—i.e., with the Nation on a basis of limited mobilization. Partly because the price of capital goods is rising

faster than other prices, moreover, only a powerful economic authority could prevent galloping inflation—and because inflation would be an easy way of disguising the declining value of real incomes, it is doubtful whether any administration would be able to resist it.

#### TOO LITTLE TOO LATE

The case against a 3 percent growth rate can be put briefly. Since man-hours will be increasing at about 1.25 percent a year, productivity would need to rise by less than 2 percent a year to make total national output rise by 3 percent. But all the evidence strongly suggests that productivity will continue to rise by at least 3 percent a year. If so, the only way the country could end up with an overall growth rate of 3 percent would be to accept no increase in the size of the labor force—i.e., to accept colossal increases in unemployment throughout the 1960's. This would be at least as unnatural as anything the forced-growth school is proposing, and so of course would be unthinkable as a national policy.

#### THE OPTIMUM IS POSSIBLE

The optimum rate of increase, the 4-plus rate, is, as we have indicated, a realistic estimate based on forces now operating in the economy. This does not mean it can come about wholly by itself. Certainly the prospect of achieving it deserves at least as much attention from the Government as the importunities of most lobbyists. But it may need nothing more from Washington than a few strokes of conservative Government policy. Since capital investment and defense together will probably have to grow a little faster than the rest of the economy in the first half of the 1960's, the Government's general policy for the 1960's should be framed to this end—i.e., to restrain a little the growth of consumption in favor of savings and capital investment.

During the next year or so, however, inflation will probably not be the chief obstacle in the way of realizing an optimum growth rate. More important is a growing manpower problem. Unemployment stands at more than 6 percent of the labor force, instead of the "normal" 4 percent, and this just as the labor force is beginning to come into its phase of rapid growth; productivity, still recovering from its recession setback, is rising at an abnormally high rate. For the time being, therefore, severe credit restrictions (especially if combined, as a few of the doughtiest inflation-fighters have proposed, with sizable Federal budget surpluses) may not add up to the best medicine for the country. Such preventives need to be used very gradually, as events dictate.

A 4 percent growth rate, of course, is not ordained by Heaven. Any number of circumstances may arise to reduce the rate somewhat—or, what is just more possible, to increase it a little. But the United States can realize its immense potentialities, without coercion or distortion, if it neither underestimates its powers nor tries to push them too hard.

#### SANCTUARY IN THE UNITED STATES FOR DALAI LAMA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, America has a long and honorable history of offering asylum to the victims of persecution, aggression, and tyranny. It may be that the Dalai Lama of Tibet will not want to depart from the continent of Asia, where his destiny has been forged. But should there be any desire on his part to live in the Western World, I urge our Government to make available to him a refuge and sanctuary in the United States from the ruthless descent

of the Chinese Communists on his little mountain kingdom.

All too infrequently of late have we been identified with the fate of those who are the targets of tyranny, and this is an opportunity for us to cement our ties with one whose people have suffered cruelly at the hands of the Communist invaders. Our record with respect to admitting Hungarian refugees is one which is more comprised—alas—of words than deeds, so the Tibetan tragedy may be a further opportunity, although, of course, with only a handful of people involved so far as flight from their homeland is concerned.

Mr. President I believe the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should contain the statement of the Dalai Lama regarding the broken promises and shattered pledges made by the Chinese Reds, as a warning to other lands which might put faith in such blandishments, and I ask unanimous consent that the Dalai Lama's statement appear in the RECORD. This is the version which was published in the New York Times of April 19, 1959, as translated via the services of the Reuters News Agency from Tezpur, in India.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TEXT OF STATEMENT ISSUED BY DALAI LAMA

TEZPUR, INDIA, April 18.—Following is the official translation of the text of a statement issued today on behalf of the Dalai Lama on his arrival here:

"It has always been accepted that the Tibetan people are different from the Han people of China.

"There has always been a strong desire for independence on the part of the Tibetan people. Throughout history this has been asserted on numerous occasions.

"Sometimes the Chinese Government has imposed their suzerainty on Tibet, and at other times Tibet has functioned as an independent country.

"In any event, at all times, even when the suzerainty of China was imposed, Tibet remained autonomous in control of its internal affairs.

"In 1951, under pressure of the Chinese Government, 17-point agreement was made between China and Tibet. In that agreement the suzerainty of China was accepted as there was no alternative left to the Tibetans.

#### "AUTONOMY PLEDGE CITED

"But even in the agreement it was stated that Tibet would enjoy full autonomy. Though the control of external events was to be in the hands of the Chinese Government it was agreed that there would be no interference by the Chinese Government with the Tibetan religion and customs and her internal administration.

"In fact, after the occupation of Tibet by the Chinese armies, the Tibetan Government did not enjoy any measure of autonomy, even in internal matters, and the Chinese Government exercised full powers in Tibetan affairs.

"In 1956 a preparatory committee was set up for Tibet with the Dalai Lama as chairman and the Panchen Lama as vice chairman and General Chang Kuo-hua as the representative of the Chinese Government.

"In practice even this body had little power and decisions in all important matters were taken by the Chinese authorities.

"The Dalai Lama and his Government tried their best to adhere to the 17-point agreement, but the interference of the Chinese authorities persisted. By the end of 1955 a struggle had started in the Kham

Province and this assumed serious proportions in 1956. In the consequential struggle the Chinese armed forces destroyed a large number of monasteries.

#### "LAMAS ARE KILLED

"Many lamas were killed and a large number of monks and officials were taken and employed on the construction of roads in China, and as the interference in the exercise of religious freedom increased the relation of Tibetans with China became openly strained from the early part of February 1959.

"The Dalai Lama had agreed a month in advance to attend a cultural show in the Chinese headquarters and the date was suddenly fixed for the 10th of March. The people of Lhasa became apprehensive that some harm might be done to the Dalai Lama and as a result about 10,000 people gathered around the Dalai Lama's summer palace at Norbulingka and physically prevented the Dalai Lama from attending the function.

"Thereafter the people themselves decided to raise a bodyguard for the protection of the Dalai Lama. Large crowds of Tibetans went about the streets of Lhasa demonstrating against the Chinese rule in Tibet. Two days later thousands of Tibetan women held demonstrations protesting against the Chinese authority.

"In spite of this demonstration from the people, the Dalai Lama and his Government endeavored to maintain friendly relations with the Chinese and tried to carry out negotiations with the Chinese representatives as to how best to bring about peace in Tibet and assuage the people's anxiety.

"While these negotiations were being carried out reinforcements arrived to strengthen the Chinese garrisons in Lhasa and Tibet.

"On the 17th of March two or three mortar shells were fired in the direction of the Norbulingka palace. Fortunately the shells fell in a nearby pond.

"After this the advisers became alive to the danger to the person of the Dalai Lama and in those difficult circumstances it became imperative for the Dalai Lama, the members of his family and his high officials to leave Lhasa. The Dalai Lama would like to state categorically that he left Lhasa and Tibet and came on to India of his own free will and not under duress.

"It was due to the loyalty and affectionate support of his people that the Dalai Lama was able to find his way through a route which is quite arduous.

"The route which the Dalai Lama took involved crossing the Kyi Chu and the Tsangpo (Brahmaputra) Rivers and making his way through the Lhoka area, Yarlung Valley, and Tsonga Dzong before reaching the Indian frontier at Kanzei Mane, near to Chuthangmu.

#### "TWO EMISSARIES SENT

"On March 29, 1959, the Dalai Lama sent two emissaries to cross the Indo-Tibetan border, requesting the Government of India's permission to enter India and seek asylum there.

"The Dalai Lama is extremely grateful to the people and Government of India for their spontaneous and generous welcome as well as the asylum granted to him and his followers. India and Tibet have religious, cultural, and trade links over a thousand years and for Tibetans it has always been the land of enlightenment, having given birth to the Lord Buddha.

"The Dalai Lama is deeply touched by the kind greetings extended to him on his safe arrival in India by the Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, and his colleagues in the Government of India. The Dalai Lama has already sent a reply to this message of greetings.

"Ever since the Dalai Lama entered India at Kanzei Mane near Chuthangmu he has experienced in full measure the respect and hospitality extended to him by the people of

the Kameng frontier division of the North East Frontier Agency, and the Dalai Lama would like to state how the Government of India's officers posted there had spared no effort in making his stay and journey through this extremely well-administered part of India as comfortable as possible.

#### "FUTURE TO BE WEIGHED

"The Dalai Lama will now be proceeding to Mussoorie, which he hopes to reach in the next few days. The Dalai Lama will give thought to his future plans and if necessary give expression to them as soon as he has had a chance to rest and reflect on recent events.

"His country and people have passed through an extremely difficult period and all that the Dalai Lama wishes to say at the moment is to express his sincere regret at the tragedy which has overtaken Tibet and to fervently hope that these troubles will be over soon without any more bloodshed.

"As Dalai Lama and spiritual head of all Buddhists in Tibet, his foremost concern is the well-being of his people and in insuring the perpetual flourishing of his sacred religion and the freedom of his country.

"While expressing once again thankfulness at his safe arrival in India, the Dalai Lama would like to take this opportunity to communicate to all his friends, well-wishers, and devotees in India and abroad his sincere gratitude for many messages of sympathies and concern with which they have flooded him."

#### POSITIVE STEPS IN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an extremely able and provocative address delivered by the distinguished majority leader of the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON] before the Women's National Press Club banquet for the American Society of Newspaper Editors, at Washington, D.C., on April 16, 1959.

The address contains several important suggestions for improving our relations with nations abroad, in a positive and effective way. I am particularly interested in his proposals in regard to a university at Hawaii to serve as a link between Asia and the United States. I am hopeful that this address will receive the wide attention it deserves.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### POSITIVE STEPS IN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, before the Women's National Press Club banquet for the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C., April 16, 1959)

Madam Chairman, Mr. Ambassador, distinguished editors, ladies, and gentlemen, throughout our national experience, the month of April has been a month of history for Americans.

Our Congress met for the first time in April 180 years ago. General Washington was inaugurated as President in the same month.

Ninety-four years ago yesterday, Lincoln died here in Washington. And 14 years ago last Sunday, Franklin D. Roosevelt passed away at Warm Springs.

Our Civil War began in April 1861—and ended in April 1865. Fifty-two years later, in April of 1917, a man from the South, Woodrow Wilson, asked the United States to enter the war to make the world safe for democracy. And in April of 1945, men met



at San Francisco to unite nations in the quest for world peace.

But of all our April anniversaries, the one which most directly affects our generation is the one which passes with the least notice. It comes next Wednesday when we enter the 13th year of the cold war.

It was on the 22d of April 1947, that the Senate approved legislation to implement the Truman doctrine. That was our official recognition of the situation into which Soviet communism had plunged the world.

My assignment tonight is to speak on positive aspects of foreign policy. I am joined in this assignment by a man who has made as many positive contributions to a stable and free world as any other—Ambassador Carlos Romulo.

#### STRONGHOLDS OF FREEDOM

The cold war has been on our part essentially a defensive struggle. We are attempting to hold fast the strongholds of freedom against the aggressions of communism. In that sense, our position at times has seemed negative.

But it is impossible to discuss positive aspects—or any other aspects—of foreign policy today except against the background of the cold war. It is the compelling fact of our day.

Although our position has been defensive, it has been imaginative and bold.

#### INITIATIVE AND FAITH

We have shown initiative—as in the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, point 4, and NATO. We have displayed courage—as in Iran, the Berlin airlift, Korea, and Lebanon. We have exhibited good faith—as in our dealings with nations we could have held as colonies.

But to a great extent, our policies have been motivated by sheer reaction to the probing thrusts of Soviet communism into the free world. And because of that motivation, we have tended to forget what should be the true moral basis of our policy.

There has been a tendency to say that we send food to India because we want to win that nation over to our side.

There has been a disposition to say that we send technicians to Southeast Asia because we want to halt the spread of communism.

#### IGNOBLE MOTIVES AND NOBLE DEEDS

There has been a readiness to exchange students with Europe because we wish to spread our ideas.

We have been ascribing ignoble motives to noble deeds. And in doing so, we have given the world the impression that we are bidding for friendship as traders bid for a sack of wheat.

Such an impression is an open invitation for those whose friendship we seek to shop around and see what the man on the other side of the street is willing to offer.

I think it is about time for us to change not our policy but our attitudes. I think it is about time for us to start proceeding on the assumption that we do things not because they are expedient but because they are right.

If we send food to India, we should do so because people are hungry and we have a surplus.

If we send technicians to Southeast Asia, we should do so because people need help and we have the necessary skills.

If we exchange students with Europe, we should do so because we wish to exchange knowledge.

#### A HANDSHAKE, NOT A TIP

The world wants America to reach out its hand for a handshake, not to leave a tip. That is the kind of America we must be.

It is fashionable, in discussing foreign policy, to call for bold, new ideas. Such ideas are always welcome—although we must never confuse mere novelty with real merit. But I

suspect our problems will be solved eventually by the vigorous and imaginative application of policies we already have in force. Some of them date back for many years.

In another April, 69 years ago, there was formed in this hemisphere the International Union of American Republics. Our Secretary of State, addressing that convention, expressed our purposes this way:

"We believe that a spirit of justice, of common and equal interests between the American States, will leave no room for an artificial balance of power like unto that which has led to wars abroad and drenched Europe in blood."

This concept applies to our times and our challenges today.

#### JUSTICE AMONG NATIONS

We do not seek anything in this world other than justice among nations. We are not setting as our goal a precarious balance of power which will maintain not peace but a fearful and uneasy stalemate.

We must rest the alliance of free men on a common interest in mankind's well-being rather than on the common bond of fear.

Our country will soon enter important conferences which may settle the destiny of the world. We are entering those conferences, unfortunately, without the services of a great and dedicated American who has borne the foreign policy burden for many years.

It is conceivable that those conferences will settle many problems. It is to be hoped that they will relax some of the tensions which now threaten to blow the world apart.

But even if those conferences should settle all questions of armaments, past treaties and boundaries—and as reasonable men we know this is doubtful—we would still be faced by a Communist challenge vital to our survival.

#### THE TWOFOLD CHALLENGE

The challenge is twofold: the economic challenge of trade and the moral challenge of understanding the people of the earth who remain outside the struggle of East and West.

Khrushchev has boasted that the Soviet Union will destroy us in economic competition. Khrushchev is no idle braggart.

And the Soviets have been working for years among the uncommitted people of the earth. It would be foolish to pretend that their work has not been effective.

To meet the challenge of trade will not be easy. It will require first exploration of the thinking of our fellow free nations to determine what steps can be taken to bring about economic unity.

To meet the challenge of human understanding, however, will be far more difficult than meeting the challenge of trade. For too many years, we have neglected the simple things that would break down the barriers between ourselves and people who should be our friends.

#### LANGUAGE BARRIERS

For example, languages spoken by hundreds of millions of people all over the earth are hardly known in our land. The official languages of nations like the Union of South Africa, Korea, the Philippines, Pakistan and others are taught nowhere in the United States.

Our printing presses produce nothing that most of the world's population can read.

There are intellectual walls which must be broken down if we are to have mutual understanding. And there are ways of breaking down those walls.

Why don't we foster truly international centers of learning where the world's best and most mature minds can meet and exchange ideas?

We have the facilities; we have the scholars; we even have the sites.

We have recently taken an historic step in the development of our Nation. A group of

mid-Pacific islands will soon share all the rights and responsibilities of the other 49 States in the Union.

The Hawaiian Islands lie astride the trade routes of the Pacific. Many of the people have close ties to the countries of the Far East. They enjoy the advantages of a university of stature and prestige.

#### AN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Why do we not establish in Hawaii an international university as a meeting place for the intellectuals of the East and the West?

Why do we not seek to attract scholars and students alike from both the Orient and the Occident?

Hawaii could be the place at which professors from Harvard, Chicago, California, and all our great universities could meet with the learned men of Tokyo, Manila, Indonesia, Southeast Asia, India and Pakistan.

The great teachers of Asia could impart their learning to students from the West. And professors from the Western Hemisphere could lay before students of Asia the knowledge that has been gained in our part of the world.

In Hawaii, barriers of language would evaporate rapidly. People would gain new understanding and new respect for each other. And the intellectual association would benefit all mankind.

This is a concept which I have discussed many times with the distinguished and able Delegate from Hawaii, JOHN BURNS. It is a concept which we could put into actuality at a fraction of the cost of the weapons which we now ship to other nations of the world.

#### A PRACTICAL IDEA

That this is a practical idea has been demonstrated already by the University of Puerto Rico.

Under the American flag, and the wise leadership of Muñoz-Marín, the University of Puerto Rico has been building a bridge of understanding between us and the people of Latin America. A door to mutual understanding has been opened.

We have learned of the vital importance of the rich Spanish cultural heritage. And the Latin Americans have learned the truth about our hearts and our souls.

The University of Puerto Rico has been such a tremendous success that it has led the Senator from Montana, MIKE MANSFIELD, and the Senator from Florida, GEORGE SMATHERS, to propose a University of the Americas. And it is an idea which has great appeal.

Hawaii, a bright, new star in our flag, could also become a bridge spanning the Pacific.

We must not underestimate the importance of this bridge. The Communists long ago realized that the destiny of mankind could be settled in Asia. Leon Trotsky, the Bolshevik theoretician, said: "The road to Paris and London might lead through Kabul, Calcutta, and Bombay."

#### COMMUNIST CONQUEST

The Communists exiled and assassinated Leon Trotsky. But they did not exile this idea. And one of the greatest single blows that has ever been dealt against the free world was the Communist conquest of 650 million Chinese—who are gaining at the rate of 13 million people a year.

Compared to the people of Asia, our population is a drop in the bucket. There are 400 million Indians increasing at the rate of 7 million a year. Eighty million people inhabit the Indonesian chain. When these are added to the millions of Japan, Korea, southeast Asia and the Middle East, totaling 1,500 million, this means our 175 million is a very small minority in this world.

#### THE CHALLENGE BEFORE US

For the challenges before us, we need both new ideas and old boldness. But our future

lies not in the multiplicity of ideas but in singleness of purpose.

That singleness of purpose must be dedication to the concept that this can be a better and freer world for all the nations.

That is not a goal which can be achieved in one night or by one idea or even by one policy. But it is a goal which is attainable if America assumes not just the political and military but the moral leadership which should be ours.

## JOHN TATSEY ACQUIRES NATIONAL REPUTATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on several occasions I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of news columns written by one of the most unique and clever journalists of our time. As many of my colleagues in the Senate will realize, I am referring to my close friend, John Tatsey, Blackfeet Indian Reservation policeman-columnist at Heart Butte, Mont.

John Tatsey writes with his own style and his columns are full of life and human interest. Recently John has received considerable acclaim and has built up a fan club in all corners of the Nation and it is composed of many notables.

Former President Harry S. Truman recently wrote me stating that Tatsey's articles "are some of the best I've ever read," comparing them to Mark Twain's announcement for President. Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton is familiar with John Tatsey's work, and I know that Tatsey has many followers here on Capitol Hill. In addition, last week's issue of Time carries a story on Tatsey.

The April 12 issue of the Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont., carries an entertaining feature story on "Montana's Modern Day Will Rogers" by Bill James, which I know every CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reader will not want to miss.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks five of the latest news columns by John Tatsey which appeared in the Glacier Reporter.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls Tribune, Apr. 12, 1959]  
BLACKFEET COLUMNIST ACQUIRING NATIONAL REPUTATION  
(By Bill James)

HEART BUTTE.—John Tatsey, Blackfeet Indian Reservation policeman-columnist, has a way with words—the Tatsey way.

Tatsey handles words with as deft a Tatsey touch as he guides reservation friends into Browning or Heart Butte jails when they drink too liberally of the cup that cheers.

Although the 65-year-old Tatsey, whose Indian name is "Weasel Necklace," ignores commonly accepted rules of grammar, spelling and punctuation, his highly individual style of writing his "Heart Butte News" column has been receiving considerable national attention.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, a devoted Tatsey fan who describes the Indian columnist as "Montana's Modern Day Will Rogers," has enjoyed many a laugh when reading Tatsey's columns and has had several of them reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Harry S. Truman, former President of the United States, is another Tatsey fan. The ex-President wrote to Senator MANSFIELD, saying Tatsey's articles "are some of the best I've ever seen."

"Have not seen anything I enjoyed more since I read Mark Twain's announcement for President," Truman added.

When Interior Secretary Fred Seaton met Tatsey at a Browning program, he joked that Tatsey received more space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than did the Secretary of State.

The current issue of Time Magazine carries a story about Tatsey. The Associated Press distributed a long feature story about Tatsey to newspapers in all parts of the Nation.

Tatsey, a good-natured man who looks younger than 65, writes his column for the Glacier Reporter but it is reprinted often in other publications. Mel Ruder, publisher-editor of the Hungry Horse News at Columbia Falls, frequently reprints Tatsey's column through a friendly agreement with the Glacier Reporter.

Dorothy Johnson, nationally known author who edits the "Montana Fourth Estate," publication of the Montana Press Association, is an ardent admirer of Tatsey and reprints choice gems of Tatsey humor. The Plentywood Herald reprints some Tatsey columns.

Other papers have asked Tatsey to write for them but he has declined to broaden his journalistic field.

"Lucky to write what I do now," he exclaims with a broad smile. His dark brown eyes reflect warmth and alertness as he casually runs a strong hand through his black hair, generously streaked with grey strands, and talks about letters and wires he has received about his writing.

"They come from all over—from Florida to California," he smiles. "Never answer. I don't know what would happen so to stay out of trouble I never write," he states.

Tatsey, a sturdy man who admits his 178 pounds is too heavy for his 5-foot 8-inch frame, admits that he writes more for the love of being a Heart Butte correspondent than for the money he receives for his newspaper stint.

Tatsey isn't sure how much money he gets from writing his weekly column.

"It's snooze money," he smiles. He has been chewing snuff since he was a boy. He doesn't pay too much attention to the money he gets from writing but points out he gets from \$9 to \$12 every few months from the Glacier Reporter and about \$6 or \$7 every few months from the Hungry Horse News.

Sometimes, he skips writing a column. During the hunting season, he takes hunting trips and occasionally guides a group of eastern friends on a trip so he is forced to forget his column for a while. When that happens, readers write and sometimes wire to find out what has happened.

Followers of Tatsey's columns are particularly fond of frequent items about activities of Stoles Head Carrier.

Some samples of his accounts of Stoles Head Carrier follow:

"Stoles Head Carrier went to Valier and got some guts or entrails and when he got home he had to cross a bridge, he slip and fell but still had guts."

"Stoles Head Carrier had a long rest and the first nice day he got George Running Wolf to take him to Valier to get repairs for his car and George had to leave him there because he could not load him in the car. So Stoles will be on the road soon."

"Tatsey was out hunting Monday morning where he saw something moving around so he waited till Joe Running Crane come up. By then we saw horses and we saw Stoles Head Carrier crawling around on hands and knees eating huckle berries. He did not see any game and come home just when the storm hit. Next day he went to town and

was having a high old time from one bar to another."

"Stoles Head Carrier was around Conrad picking rock and someone started to bring him home and was lost in Valier and have not heard anything of him. Sure miss him at Heart Butte."

Tatsey says readers always ask what is wrong if he fails to mention Stoles Head Carrier in a column.

"When he behaves himself I got nothing on him," Tatsey explains.

Tatsey acknowledges he is fond of his friend, Head Carrier, a man of about 50 who weighs close to 300 pounds.

"Stoles has a good sense of humor and laughs about the things I write about him," Tatsey says. "It's true when I write about him so what can he do?" he asks seriously.

Tatsey says Stoles kids him too and that there is a give-and-take arrangement about kidding.

When Tatsey mentioned in his column Senator MANSFIELD had asked to meet him, Dorothy Johnson reprinted the column in "Montana Fourth Estate" with this note: "Some people would be knocked off their feet at being invited to meet a U.S. Senator at the Senator's specific request, but with Tatsey this incident has to take its turn after deer hunting, lost horses, potato picking, and tooth pulling."

Writing about his meeting with Senator MANSFIELD, Tatsey told about being called early to be in Browning, adding, "When Senator MANSFIELD came Mr. and Mrs. Tatsey had a picture taken with him. Mike had his medicine pipe with him but did not offer Tatsey a peace smoke so Tatsey did not take him into the tribe or give him his Indian name but still we meet and made friends."

Tatsey said he has a high degree of respect for his friend, Senator MANSFIELD. In a recent column, Tatsey wrote:

"There was the Wolf Point Herald paper drifted in the Blackfeet Reservation and there were statements in it where the Sioux and Assiniboines are fighting over their tribal councilmen and some of our Democrats in the District of Columbia. We would not want to see our good friend, MIKE MANSFIELD, scalped. Better get a short haircut."

At times, Tatsey gives his Heart Butte readers a bit of advice like this: "There have been a tooth puller at Heart Butte the past week taking care of bad, bad teeth. Remember Heart Butte people there is some elk meat coming this winter and might be tough."

Tatsey keeps track of vital statistics in this manner:

"Mrs. Louise Old Rock has been buried at Heart Butte Cemetery. She passed away last Saturday morning at Blackfeet Hospital."

"Mrs. Lizzie Roundman passed away some time Saturday night and will be buried at Heart Butte. She leaves three sons and six daughters."

Social happenings receive this treatment: "Mr. and Mrs. George Duck Head are visiting Mrs. Maggie Spotted Eagle for the weekend."

But items that stir the most comments are ones like these:

"A young man became a single guy last fall and last week he took a notion to use the old Indian custom of paying for a wife, he offered two cows but the mother said she would think it over."

"Vick Gregory the teacher left for Missoula Tuesday where he will get married and bring her back to Heart Butte."

"Two weeks ago four airmen came to Heart Butte for a stick game. They played couple of hours and when one got up he stopped, his outer overalls were around his ankles and he was hobbled with them. Good thing he had double pants on but he did not know what happened."

Tatsey doesn't hesitate to name names when he reports happenings at Heart Butte.



Writing about a Heart Butte man, he said the fellow visited a tavern for a few hours while his wife was waiting outside in the car. He said when the man came out "he had a young Browning girl and stopped at a corner and put his arms around her when his wife told him we are ready to go, he froze there for a minute."

Duties of a policeman are never far from Tatsey's mind. For instance, he mentioned in one column a Heart Butte man who "was picked up Sunday night back of George Whippert place where he was hung up by one leg on a barbed wire fence. More fences would help the police."

Tatsey's special brand of reservation humor is making his columns conversation pieces and collectors' items. For instance, he wrote about an elderly Indian who "was coming out of the tribal store with a bag of meat and bread when a young lady came and took the bag and told him that she would go home with him and cook and feed him. She walked so fast he could not keep up."

Or, his story about an Indian who was "a little intoxicated" last week. "He was all alone around the house. Tatsey was watching him with a field glass. Pretty soon he wheeled out a bicycle and put it on a little hill and got on and went down and took a spill. He left the bike there."

Then, Tatsey writes about a Heart Butte citizen who went out one morning with two buckets after water. "He never came back so one of his daughters went down to see what happened. The buckets were there but no father. He was already in Valier; he went after something stronger than white tall water."

Tatsey doesn't mind giving a friend a pat on the back. An example: "John Beaver from upper Big Badger had a party at Mike Swims Under place when the spud pickers came back. Mike played the fiddle and Beaver picked on the guitar so when you want a musician get Beaver."

Tatsey's career as a columnist began about 4 years ago when the publisher of the Glacier Reporter suggested that Tatsey was in an excellent position to write the Heart Butte column because he was one of the respected leaders and oldest residents in addition to being a policeman.

The policeman agreed to try writing. His columns became successful almost instantly in the Heart Butte area and with the 1,200 subscribers of the Glacier Reporter.

His position as a policeman has had a tendency to keep griping to a low murmur—and vigorous protests few and far between. The column added to his high standing in the community.

Naturally, there have been some complaints but Tatsey doesn't worry about them.

"I tell them what's what and that's all," he explains. "I tell them I write only what's true."

While a few complain about what he writes, the most complaints come from people who say they don't see their names in the paper often enough. Many friends volunteer choice bits of news about their neighbors and practically all of the Heart Butte area residents take pride in his writing. (Heart Butte was credited with a population of 100 in the 1950 census but Tatsey says there are about 250 to 300 families with a population of about 1,000 in the area.)

Milo K. Fields, publisher-editor of the Glacier Reporter, is proud of his star columnist and likes him personally.

"When I first came here 3 years ago after buying the paper, I was scared to death about his writing," Fields admits.

Fields pointed out that many Heart Butte people come to the Reporter's office every week to buy the paper so they can read Tatsey's column.

Explaining that he doesn't edit Tatsey's writing, except at rare times when the meaning isn't clear, Fields said "the secret of it is leaving it natural."

When readers appear at the Reporter office to complain about something Tatsey wrote, Fields refers them to Tatsey.

"Tatsey says they just don't defy his authority," the editor added.

Blackfeet tribal officials follow his column and get many laughs from it.

"I have always wondered how the world he gets away with all he does," one tribal council official laughed. "I wouldn't last overnight if I wrote that about them; I'd be scalped."

The official explained that Heart Butte is a closely knit community that would permit a respected oldtimer and leader like Tatsey to write lightly about it but would bitterly resent it if any outsider did the same.

Tatsey, born on his father's ranch near Heart Butte, says he is all Indian but that his father was a Canadian Blood Indian and his mother a Blackfeet.

He attended the Holy Family Mission School about 15 miles south of Browning.

"I got up to the seventh grade before I started to work for the Reclamation Service," he recalls. He helped put in irrigation ditches, driving mules pulling scrapers and other work around the irrigation project.

Tatsey has had a great deal of ranch experience. He and his son, Peter, are partners in a cattle ranch near Heart Butte. Tatsey has title to 320 acres of patent land and leases about 1,800 acres from individual landowners. His son leases land in addition to that his father has. The partners now have about 100 head of Hereford cattle and Peter also has about 200 sheep.

There are two Tatsey children living—Peter and a daughter, Mrs. Roy Doore of Browning. One son, Joseph, was killed in the South Pacific in 1943. An infantryman, Joseph was at Pearl Harbor when the Japanese opened the war.

Mrs. Tatsey, whose mother was a Sioux and her father Spanish-Mexican, wears the long braids of the older Indian women. An alert woman, Belle Tatsey is a warm-hearted and genial lady with poise and an excellent sense of humor.

Tatsey, who is paid \$300 each month for his policeman's duties, has been on the force steadily since 1950 but was a policeman off and on for a few years before 1950.

The Tatseys are popular in the Heart Butte area and frequently have visitors even before they are awake.

"They build a fire for us and put the coffee on," Mrs. Tatsey explains. "We always have someone visiting us," he adds proudly.

Friends of Tatsey say it is funny to see him bring a carload of friends from Heart Butte to Browning and then arrest them after they live it up too much in the bars.

Tatsey admits that looks funny but he points out there is a practical side involved. If he didn't give them rides, they would get to Browning another way, do as much drinking and then get in more serious trouble than they do when he books them at the jail for a short stay.

Mrs. Tatsey comments that it's real funny to hear a group of Indians sing when Tatsey takes them to Browning to stand trial.

"Some sing in English and some in Indian and then they argue which singing is best," she says. "I tell them just to be quiet when we are in town."

"Tatsey knows how to handle people," Fields says. "I have seen him take an Indian twice as big as he is and walk him down the sidewalk. And when John told the fellow to walk lively, the man would."

"Tatsey has guts," his friends proudly state. They tell about the time FBI agents and deputy sheriffs were keeping a wary watch on a house where they had cornered a man who had shot and killed another Indian.

Tatsey drove up and walked calmly to the house, opened the door, and walked in. A few moments later, he appeared with the murderer, who, fortunately, had been asleep with three guns concealed in the bed.

A man who speaks on a higher plane than he writes, Tatsey reads magazines and the Great Falls newspapers. He likes to read the Official Detective magazine even though his granchildren say he should read the Bible more.

"Official Detective helps on my police work," Tatsey explains. "It gives me ideas on law enforcement."

Tatsey is deeply sympathetic about the plight of the Blackfeet. He thinks the thing needed most on the reservation is a housing program to furnish homes for young people.

"Too many are crowded into small homes," he says.

Then there is a desperate need for some industry on or near the reservation, he believes.

"There just aren't jobs for the people, and that is a hopeless condition for the young, especially, to be in," he contends. "The Federal Government don't help the Indians much," he said, referring to the money the Government spends on foreign aid.

Discussing the Government's resettlement program for Indians, Tatsey points out it isn't too good for the Blackfeet.

"The Indians don't stay resettled, because they are not used to cities and long for the country," he says. "The resettlement program works better with mixed bloods than with fullbloods," he adds.

Tatsey would like to see a small sawmill started on the reservation so the men could saw timber to build the homes that are needed so badly.

The average Indian on the reservation doesn't think much about the danger of an atomic or hydrogen war, Tatsey said, explaining, "They don't read too much and they think about today, not about a war ahead. I tell them they should read to find out more but they don't do it."

The affable Tatsey smiles and said, "Oh, yes," when asked if he enjoyed writing—which he does by pen on any kind of paper available since he does not type. Saying it takes him about half an hour to write a column, Tatsey doesn't know whether he would like to be a full-time writer.

"Well, when I run out of a job, I might," he said.

He likes Senator MANSFIELD's description of him as "Montana's modern day Will Rogers."

"I read about that Rogers fellow in Grit magazine and think he was pretty good. I'd like to team up with that man if he was alive," the Heart Butte sage remarked.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Feb. 12, 1959]

#### HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Last week's blizzard was really felt by the people the day the payment was made. The storm put a little relief on the police force.

Mrs. Maggie Marceau was rushed to the hospital last Sunday when she had a sudden gallstone attack.

Duffy Comes at Night, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Comes at Night, arrived last Saturday from New York. Expected to be home for a while.

The funeral of baby New Breast was held Saturday at the Heart Butte Cemetery.

Mr. Richard Gregory, the teacher at Heart Butte, made a trip to Missoula on business. Returned Sunday.

Mr. and Mrs. Peter Tatsey motored to Cut Bank Monday where Peter got his license for his cars and a generator so he will have lights till some time when the REA has time to set poles.

George Whippert drove to Valier last week and got himself light fixtures and wire so he

will have good lights for stick games and good coffee.

The little story about our Governor having some difficulty over his future mansion: The Blackfeet have a little hard time with funds to get by through the last quarter of the winter, but whenever they make up their minds they will try something to fill their promise. They would sure want to give a new tepee. If they cannot buy the goods, there are enough elk hides to make his office and living quarters fair, Governor, anyhow.

There was some disturbance around Mr. Bobick home at the square. One evening someone was making a lot of noise outside so he grabbed his shotgun and hollered out the window get the h--- away, but found out it was Mrs. Bob Englemont playing with her little girl on a snowbank.

Stoles has been in Browning since the per capita payment and has changed quarters. He was seen sleeping in the Yegan lobby where he is not crowded by prisoners.

Joe Running Crane went after water the other morning. When he dip the bucket he slipped and fell in and cut his forehead on the ice. Came in the house, his wife bandaged his head then he went out and started his car and went and stuck his fingers near the fanbelt and nearly cut two fingers off. He will know better next time.

This is all true happenings only with a little joke to finish off with. Be good sports be with you next week.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Mar. 26, 1959]

#### HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

The news from Heart Butte was late for print so will gather some happenings from last week. There was not much of anything but should have some good stuff as the weather gets better.

O. E. Boggs was a visitor from down Shelby way last week; everyone surprised to see him show up around; he left here a few years ago.

Swede Aubert was here on the 10th of this month giving commodities and this week he was here issuing blankets.

Robert Kirkland was a visitor at the Tatsey quarters last Tuesday on an investigation case.

Albert Spearson is out around checking on Old Peoples Home for repairs and additions.

Most everyone received blankets and were glad to get them even if the weather warmed; there is another winter coming.

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Doore motored to Great Falls Monday where Mrs. Doore attended a Stanley Products meeting.

The recruiting officer from Great Falls was here Monday signing boys for the Armed Forces; boys will be leaving for Butte next week for their examinations.

Perry Spotted Eagle, Vincent New Robe, Fredie Old Rock were picked up by Tatsey on warrants for not paying their fines when they promised to get out and get the fine money. Boys, better settle with James H. Walters; you may need a room sometime.

Last week Chief Big Eagle went out one morning with two buckets after water; he never came back so one of his daughters went down to see what happened; the buckets were there but no Big Eagle. He was already in Valler; he went after something stronger than white tail water.

Stoles has been going to town but awful careful what he does.

The Heart Butte Trapper has returned to Heart Butte and has started his traplines; first night two beaver.

Peter H. Tatsey went to Fisher Flats and bought some alfalfa hay for lambing use;

and also the cattle are calving; has new calves, lost one.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Apr. 2, 1959]

#### HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Easter Sunday was a big day at Heart Butte. People came from different parts for church.

Albert Spearson the carpenter on old folks home has finished several homes so far and Earl Olinger had the contract of remodeling the jail and is now ready to accommodate the boys.

Tatsey the police was in Browning when the \$25 payment was made. It sure was a mob. There was a young lady who was pushed around and when she finally got in she did not have any shoes and another girl got in but her coat got caught in the door. She just walked out of it and got her \$25.

Stoles Head Carrier came to town day before the payment and spent his time at J. H. Walters' place 'till after the payment was over so he did not get in on the other guys treat.

The roads department have started working on the Old Agency-Heart Butte road so it won't be so rough.

The sheepman Larson of Big Badger sheared his sheep last week. Lucky the weather is good.

The piece in the Tribune last week when there was an item on John Tatsey and who ever wrote it did a good job with one or two errors but it still made John feel like somebody. Thanks.

John Tall Feathers came home last Saturday from Great Falls where he had his feet taken off at the Columbus hospital and is now at the Blackfeet hospital.

Mrs. Francis Spotted Eagle has been brought back from Great Falls where she went under operation and is now at the Blackfeet hospital.

Oliver Marceau, Perry Spotted Eagle, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Marceau were jailed last week for disturbing peace at Heart Butte.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Apr. 14, 1959]

#### HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Sam New Breast and John Tatsey were sent to Missoula last Friday where they attended the meetings of other tribes. Meetings were interesting of different speeches made.

Tatsey was welcomed by the University staff, and Tatsey felt that he knew these people a long time. Meet a lot of friends through the items which he writes from Heart Butte. There were a few from other reservations who came. James Sweeney and wife were from Wolf Point and Henry Archdale and Leslie Four Star from Frazer. There were more Flat Heads dressed Indian costumes and danced different ceremonial dances.

New Breast and Tatsey returned home Sunday night. They enjoyed a fine trip. There was a barbecue elk so that sure hit the spot on the part of the Indians. Real good meal.

Heart Butte people got bad when the police was gone Saturday and Sunday but nothing hurt.

Mr. and Mrs. G. G. Kipp of Old Agency drove to Missoula and returned Sunday.

Mr. and Mrs. James H. Walters motored to Hot Springs where Jim bathed on Sunday afternoon and got home OK.

These are some happenings that came out from Browning last week. There is a little change in the give-me-a-dime business. They kiss you for a dime although these are men that are doing the kissing.

There was a man on the street last week. He got angry at a turtle and chased it across the street but could not catch up to it.

Stole Head Carrier went hunting last Saturday and came out with some elk. Wonder how he got it. Stoles has been wearing a red sweater with three white stripes. One for being a good talker, one for being a good border at Good Talker, and one for being a good border at James Walters. The third will have to ask where.

Sam New Breast went to Helena Wednesday for a church gathering.

Sam Spotted Eagle and family are motor-ing to Helena to be there Thursday for the church convention.

There has been a lot of talking and taking of pictures of your Heart Butte reporter so there should be some understanding. There were pictures in the Tribune which every one wanted in the Sunday paper just to see and read what Tatsey looked like and what he had to say in the Tribune.

Joe Running Crane said someone was riding around Four Horn Lake and saw some trout swimming along the edge of the lake when the lead fish came out of the water and asked this rider if Joe Day Rider and Dan Boss Ribs were still living.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Apr. 16, 1959]

#### JOHN TATSEY, INDIAN REPORTER

The national publicity our Heart Butte reporter, John Tatsey, has been getting lately is enough to make any newspaper man or writer jealous. Few, if any, journalists have several times been given three or four pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, space in Time magazine, and four pictorial pages in a magazine section of a large daily, not to mention many writeups in any number of weekly papers that reprint his column.

Usually such publicity is given only to those persons of prominent or outstanding character, or those who are noted for their exceptional accomplishments. So, why not John Tatsey? John is a man of outstanding character, rare ability, and probably the best known weekly columnist in these United States.

Tatsey ponders somewhat bewilderedly over all of this publicity, which has not changed his good-humored style of writing in the least, and only comments, "Don't the rest of the people know that the Indians read and write now days?"

"I write because I like it," John continues, "and I tell the truth about what I know. Indians are naturally happy people and they like to kid each other. I do a little kidding by writing about my friends, all in fun, and nobody gets hurt."

Tatsey's main philosophy is a good joke, written or spoken. "If I can make someone else smile or laugh, I figure it helps everyone," he comments. "If a fellow gets drunk or gets arrested, it's his own fault and he should expect to be kidded about it."

John has many ways of expressing his humor, sometimes in form of a warning. For instance, when he has to escort one of his problem friends to Jimmy Walters' boarding-house (tribal jail) he often laughingly tells them he is taking them to the best first-class hotel in town, but they must keep the room clean because they may be back there the next night.

Jimmy's hotel is one of John's main subjects of pen. "And why not?" John emphasizes. "Jimmy has more customers every night than all the rest of the hotels put together. He runs a good boardinghouse and the customers can always find some of their friends there to visit with. It's the only place in the world like it. Everything is strictly personal, even the service. You do everything personally."

"You know, it's too bad they can't print 'smoke signals,' I could really tell them some hot news," John laughs.

That is John Tatsey, and that is the way he writes. He calls his shots, names the ball. And who can argue against the truth?



### A PROGRAM FOR THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently I suggested to the Senate a program for the national forests sent to the Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture be referred to both the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In some quarters this report is being heralded as a great achievement on the part of Secretary Benson. It is a great achievement but I am inclined to think that the Secretary knows that the course for him to follow has been well charted for him. He did not need to "break new ground," as Gifford Pinchot said in describing his efforts to create and develop our national forests system.

Secretary Benson has received numerous urgings from the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and many other Senators to present this long-range program. In 1956, the senior Senator from Montana requested that this program be developed. He reiterated his request again in June of 1958 with a special committee print on "Full Development of Our Public Resources." Again in July of last year under the leadership of the senior Senator from Montana, the Montana delegation had the Forest Service regional office in Missoula prepare a special study on the full development of Montana's forest resources. That report was published as a Senate document in January of this year. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Great Falls Tribune, entitled "A Program for Vast Growth of Forest Products Industry," be printed in the RECORD.

In his customary quiet manner, the senior Senator from Montana has provided not only leadership but catalytic action which has propelled Secretary Benson to bring forth this long overdue but well-conceived program for our national forests. Because these forests are so important to our Nation and so vital to the development of the West, it is my hope that the Congress will give full and careful consideration to his recommendations. For my own part, I intend to be guided by Secretary Benson's own words, which I quote:

Legislative authorities for the recommended program are generally adequate . . . appropriation requests to implement the program will be submitted to the Congress in future years in connection with budget presentations after due consideration of the overall physical needs and resources of the Federal Government.

It is my view that we cannot delay putting this program into effect and that it should receive careful consideration by the Appropriations Committee, with the thought in mind that selected programs which are inadequately financed under this year's budget be given reasonable increases.

It is my hope that the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will proceed as it has in the past in its efforts to seek improvements of all the programs on the national forests created from the public domain. It is also my hope that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will give consideration to

the problems of the eastern forests other than those created from the public domain. Between the efforts of these two great committees, the Congress should be able to arrive at a determination of the steps which are needed for full water, forest, range, recreation and mineral development of our national forests.

As a westerner, I am keenly aware of the role the national forests are going to play in our future development. The senior Senator from Montana has long supplied leadership in securing recognition of this role. I congratulate him on his achievements, past and prospective.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune of February 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A PROGRAM FOR VAST GROWTH OF FOREST PRODUCTS INDUSTRY

There perhaps is no field of potential development in Montana that offers more favorable possibilities for profitable expansion than that based on our forest resources. That situation gives prime importance to a long-time program sponsored by Montana's congressional delegation to open the way for a statewide growth in this category.

Productive possibilities were inventoried last summer by Regional Forester Charles L. Tebbe and are set forth in a 40-page report under the title: "Full Use and Development, Timber Resources of Montana."

Sparked by favorable markets, modern processing methods and new timber uses, Montana's forests are already a highly important factor in our expanding economy. According to the Forest Service survey, they are providing some 8,000 full-time jobs, representing \$40 million in annual payroll, in primary production of timber products. That includes the processing necessary to convert the timber into products for the wholesale market, such as dry-surfaced lumber and dimension, pulpwood or pulp, power poles, posts and Christmas trees. Another 1,600 full-time jobs—some \$8 million a year in wages—are derived from additional processing of wood in Montana. That is exclusive of about 1,100 Federal, State and private foresters and their employees who are paid nearly \$7 million a year.

But, according to the study, these same forests could provide for triple the number of full-time jobs, and triple the present payroll in primary production. Secondary expansion could boost the total annual payroll to more than a quarter of a billion dollars.

The main initial requirement for starting this expansion snowball is construction of adequate roads to open these forest resources to use.

Montanans in Congress and others from States of extensive forest acreage are properly pressing for a speed-up in the program for constructing such roads.

This program would pay big dividends. It would not denude the forests because the Forest Service is charged with the responsibility of seeing that it is carried forward on a sustained growth basis.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF FORT CLATSOP NATIONAL MEMORIAL IN OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most comprehensive and thorough report on the progress of development of the Fort Clatsop National Memorial was

given to the 12th annual Pacific Northwest History Conference in Portland, Oreg., by Dr. John Hussey, historian of the National Park Service in the Pacific seaboard area.

Dr. Hussey's information is most encouraging to those of us who successfully sponsored the Fort Clatsop legislation in the 85th Congress. Fort Clatsop is located near Astoria, Oreg.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Oregonian of April 13, 1959, entitled "Fort Clatsop Monument Project Faces Two-Year Land Acquisition Period," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to add my own thought that I have been very favorably impressed with the businesslike approach of Dr. Hussey and other officials of the National Park Service to this great historic commemoration connected with the immortal expedition of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FORT CLATSOP MONUMENT PROJECT FACES 2-YEAR LAND ACQUISITION PERIOD

(By John Bailey)

Completion of Fort Clatsop at Astoria as a national historical monument will come within 2 years after necessary land is acquired, a representative of the National Park Service told the 12th annual Pacific Northwest History Conference in Portland Saturday.

Final day of the conference's session brought talks by prominent Northwest historians and was highlighted Saturday night by a fashion show of authentic Indian costumes and authentic Indian dances.

In a business session, Sigfried Rolland, professor of history at the University of Idaho, was retained as chairman of the conference; Thomas Vaughan, director of the Oregon Historical Society, was reelected to the executive committee, and Bruce LeRoy, director of the Washington State Historical Society, was named secretary-treasurer.

Outlining future plans of the National Park Service in the Northwest, Dr. John Hussey of San Francisco stressed proposed improvement of the Fort Clatsop monument. Members of the Oregon Historical Society sponsored the historical conference's fifth annual spring history forum here Thursday, Friday, and Saturday in the Multnomah Hotel.

#### LAND NEEDED

Dr. Hussey said acquisition of land is all that stands in the way of completing the monument, and he said it will be finished within 2 years after the land is obtained.

The speaker said the Park Service found that residential building was encroaching on the area needed for the monument and the agency recommended its area be increased to 125 acres.

Designated boundaries of the monument approved March 27 by the Secretary of the Interior included that acreage, and Clatsop County officials have agreed to relocate a county road which presently interferes with development plans, he said.

Plans call for re-creating the historic scene which served as the winter camp of Lewis and Clark in the winter of 1805 and 1806, and construction of a visitors' center and parking lot. With completion of the project, visitors will be able to walk the same trail to the river which was used by Lewis and Clark more than 150 years ago, he said.

He urged history teachers to make use of the monument as an aid in teaching by making field trips to the site with students.

## EXPLANATION FURNISHED

Dr. Hussey said the National Park Service is obligated not only to preserve and recreate the past but to explain events which took place there.

"It is a source of history without which we can't write about history and can't understand it," he said. "It has the power to make the past come alive."

Also on National Park Service drawing boards for further development are the Sitka National Monument in Alaska, the Whitman Monument near Walla Walla, Wash., Fort Vancouver, and lava beds near Klamath Falls.

Dr. Hussey explained that appropriations for monument development formerly were on the hit-or-miss basis which did not always provide sufficient funds for proposed projects. Present proposals will be made possible through Mission 66, which provides for preparation of areas under national park supervision for some 80 million visitors by 1966.

Supplementing Dr. Hussey's remarks was William Everhart, also of San Francisco, who explained that the Park Service is conducting an extensive study for possible historical monuments and recently has completed a report on the route of the Lewis and Clark expedition to Fort Clatsop.

Other speakers during the conference's afternoon session were Dr. Erna Gunther, of the Washington State Museum in Seattle, who discussed "Captain George Vancouver in the Washington Country," and Mrs. Hazel Mills, Oregon State Library, who gave a biography of Frances Fuller Victor, Oregon historian.

Don Willner, Portland attorney who served as chairman of a legislative interim committee on migratory labor in Oregon, compared the migrants of today to those 100 years ago when pioneers moved into the Oregon country.

He said pioneers faced unlimited opportunities in a land of plenty while the migrants of today face a lifetime of want. Willner said the committee found that average wage of the migrant laborers is \$32 a week for head of the family or \$80 for the entire family, a total of about \$1,000 a year.

Climaxing the 3-day forum was presentation of native Indian costumes of Pacific Northwest tribes by Dr. Gunther held in conjunction with authentic dances of the Kwakwaka'wakw culture presented by the Holm Dancers of Seattle.

## RESIGNATION OF SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the resignation of Secretary of State Dulles is now official.

Last year I wrote a guest column for the late Tom Stokes. I used it to express my respect and admiration for the manner in which Mr. Dulles conducted his office. During the past year his record is one of even greater achievement. My sentiments for that work only emphasize what I said a year ago. For this reason I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks so much of the article referred to as applies to Mr. Dulles and his work.

We can be truly thankful that we have had in the office of Secretary of State a man so dedicated and so able as John Foster Dulles. His resignation is a loss to every American and, in fact, to the entire free world. Though he will be sorely missed, he is being succeeded

by a man whom I know to be able, well-informed and patriotic, the Honorable Christian A. Herter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES' DEDICATION TO NATION: SECRETARY'S STEADFASTNESS IS CALLED BENEFIT TO UNITED STATES AND OBSTACLE TO FOE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is another in the Statesmen's Series of columns being written by distinguished personages in the Government, national affairs, business, and the military for Thomas L. Stokes, who is seriously ill.)

(By Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts)

Since the beginning of our Nation, courage and fortitude have been hallmarks of America and the American way of life. Our cities, towns and farms were carved out of a wilderness; our Government was created out of a fight for freedom.

We have had to have strong leaders to guide us during the growth of our Nation. Courage and determination are, therefore, among the most priceless qualities of our heritage and of those who serve our country. These qualities have very much distinguished our present Secretary of State.

The primary duty of a Secretary of State is to advance the interests of our country around the world, protect American citizens and their interests in other countries and to do his utmost to keep peace. Secretary John Foster Dulles has done just that.

He has always worked primarily to promote the security of the United States and the cause of peace. He has indeed devoted his entire life to advancing the interests of our Nation in international affairs. Without his guidance of these tremendous international problems, we might well have suffered many more setbacks and achieved much less in our cold war struggles.

President Eisenhower's policies with Mr. Dulles' advice and guidance have kept us out of war without sacrificing our principles and without compromising the objectives which we seek. Although from day to day we cannot be sure that we are free from the threat of aggression, we have maintained under this leadership peace without compromise.

But whether we agree with Mr. Dulles' policies or not, I think all of us must agree on one thing—he has been determined in his beliefs, steadfast in his devotion to America's peaceful objectives. He has stood firm for the principles he knows to be in the best interests of the United States.

He has been bitterly attacked here at home by those who disagree with his handling of our international problems. At one time he was sharply criticized for his statement that our Nation was on the brink of war; yet at the same time he is criticized for giving way in the face of the Communist aggression.

He is attacked for failing to inject any daring new ideas into our foreign policy, yet he is criticized for his personal visits with heads of state all over the world—a Dulles innovation. He is attacked for refusing to accede to the futile gestures offered by the Russians with respect to a summit conference; he is criticized for not being more vigorous in demanding the return of American citizens held by the Communists and in the same breath he has been criticized for not permitting Americans to travel in those areas where the Communists have been known to seize visitors from the Western World.

His steadfastness in the face of bitter attacks has repeatedly paid off in advancing U.S. interests throughout the world. He stood fast when the last stronghold of Nationalist China stood in the shadow of the Communist tyrant—Formosa was saved. His firmness in the face of the crises in Vietnam

and the Middle East has proved to be insurmountable to the Communists.

The recent SEATO meetings in Manila have indicated an unusual singleness of purpose among its member nations. After the first day of meetings, when all of the speakers joined to voice a common anti-Communist purpose, the Soviets renewed their propaganda barrage against Mr. Dulles.

These characteristics of Mr. Dulles have been particularly manifest in his stand on the Russian urgings for a summit meeting. He has been firm in his insistence that all preparatory steps must be concluded before any such conference is held.

He and the President want to insure that a summit conference has a chance for real progress toward the achievement of world peace and that it is not merely a spectacular vehicle for Communist propaganda. At the same time we certainly will not close any avenue, no matter how difficult the task may be, to achieve world peace. But we must not be deluded into a summit conference which because of lack of adequate preparation can only result in an opportunity for increased Russian propaganda.

Mr. Dulles has negotiated more with the Russians than has any other living American. Thus his judgment as to the conditions under which negotiations will best serve the interests of the free world is of utmost importance, not alone to us but also to our allies.

Since the retirement of Winston Churchill, Mr. Dulles has become the No. 1 target of Communist attacks. More propaganda has been directed against him by the Soviets than against any other living person.

This is a tribute to his courage and to his effectiveness as a negotiator with the Russians during the past decade; his only sin is his dedication to America and the principles we stand for. For this I commend him; he deserves the support of all Americans.

## A REPORT BY HON. AVERELL HARRIMAN FROM INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, following the elections in New York last fall, Gov. Averell Harriman, who has devoted many full and useful years in the service of our country, did not choose a life of easy retirement. In a move which typifies his great energy and his devotion to his country, Governor Harriman went to India and Pakistan for firsthand observations of developments in one of the troubled areas of the world.

Governor Harriman reported his visit to the American people through a series of articles written for the North American Newspaper Alliance and published throughout this country and in many foreign newspapers.

Governor Harriman's articles are so informative that I believe most Senators will wish to read them. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT FROM INDIA AND PAKISTAN  
(By Averell Harriman)

ARTICLE I. HARRIMAN, ON TOUR, FINDS INDIA AWARE OF RED CHINA'S MENACE

NEW DELHI, India.—The best news out of India today is that her leaders are finally aware of the menace of Communist China.

Impressed by communism's achievements but repelled by its methods, they are now



facing up to the fact that the world's most populous democracy is in crucial competition with the world's most populous dictatorship. Either they or the Chinese will become the model for Asia's awakening peoples.

This has been the underlying theme in all the talks I have had this past week with India's top leaders, including Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, as well as local officials. The Chinese, once hailed as partners in Asia's struggle against colonialism, are now beginning to be regarded with apprehension as rivals in a race to improve the living standards of half the people of earth. As director of India's Institute of Population Studies wrote last month, "Before we realize what is happening, Red China may be breathing down our neck."

Concern about China is not often expressed publicly—although Mr. Nehru did refer to it in November as an army camp—but this is because India's official policy, though dedicated to democracy, is one of nonalignment in the cold war. Privately, government officials at many echelons cite China and its commune system as a reason for spurring the realization of their second 5-year plan as well as carefully preparing for the third 5-year plan starting in 1961.

"We have awakened our people's expectations," I was told by a young man in charge of a community development project. "They are becoming impatient. And if we do not satisfy their expectations, they will be attracted by the achievements of our neighbor to the north."

He did not need to add that if India's 400 million people ever followed China's Communist example, the rest of Asia would soon follow suit.

#### *New sense of urgency*

This sense of urgency in the competition is not only something new in India (it was not so long ago that Mr. Nehru expressed fraternal praise of Communist China), but it is one of several factors that have gradually mellowed Indian attitudes toward the United States. After a week in the country, I fully agree with India's Ambassador to Washington, who recently said that "our relations have never been better." The expressions of friendliness toward the United States that I have heard everywhere are a welcome contrast to the criticism and even suspicion that an American could expect to encounter a few years ago.

What has happened is that India's leaders, increasingly aware of their identity with the democratic world, are today less inclined to find fault with every aspect of our sometimes misguided foreign policy.

#### *Four factors for change*

I think there are at least four factors—apart from the concern over China—that have softened Indian feelings about the United States in the last 2 or 3 years:

First, we have been fortunate in that our two Ambassadors during this period—JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and Ellsworth Bunker—are the kind of men Indians like and respect.

Second, there have been fewer careless statements out of Washington—such as Secretary of State Dulles' ill-considered remark about Goa. [In December 1955, Secretary Dulles and the Portuguese Foreign Minister issued a statement referring to "Portugal's provinces in the Far East." The Indian Government interpreted this as meaning the United States supported Portugal's claim that Goa, a settlement on the West Coast of the Indian subcontinent, is a province of Portugal. The Indian position is that Goa is a colony held by force. Officially, the United States position on Goa has always been neutral.]

And there is a more understanding attitude by our press of India's problems and sensitivities. At the same time, first hand

reports by Indian visitors to the United States have helped dispel some of the myths about United States materialism.

Third, the Soviet Union's brutal intervention in Hungary—and the murder of Imre Nagy—shocked many Indians into realizing what Soviet colonialism means.

Fourth, our relatively modest but timely economic aid—mostly loans with no strings attached—has favorably impressed Indian leaders who were formerly suspicious of our motives.

Perhaps I should also mention that after 12 years of independence, India's leaders are more sure of themselves (and therefore less sensitive to criticism) and better able to appreciate their friends in the West now that time has cooled the left-over passions of colonial days.

#### *Problems India faces*

With this new political maturity has come the realization that Americans, more than most people, are in a position to understand what Nehru this month called the "tremendous adventure" of building up a new nation by democratic means.

But these first, encouraging impressions of a country I had not seen since 1946—the year before independence—should not obscure the fact that India is beset by social, economic and political problems that fairly stagger the imagination. This is a nation where four out of five people can still not read or write.

It is a country short of technicians, short of capital, short of nearly everything except people. And people are increasing about half as fast again as food production; despite Government-backed program of birth control, there are 6 million more Indians to be fed, housed, clothed, and employed every year.

That is why India is a nation desperately in need of assistance if her tremendous adventure is not to end in tremendous tragedy. In her race with Communist China, which has received massive Soviet aid topped by a 5-billion-ruble loan this month, India has certain advantages—vigorous and determined leadership, a well-trained civil service, world-renowned scientists, a good railroad system, and a fledgling industrial base, undamaged by war, on which to build.

Her big disadvantage is that the democratic methods of education and persuasion are not as quick as those of a ruthless dictatorship in achieving the spectacular production increases that Asians are being told to expect.

India's progress is steady and impressive. Thanks to the community development program, life in one-half of the nation's 500,000 villages is brighter after many years of darkness. But the ambitious goals of the second 5-year plan are not being met, and the third will flounder without substantial injections of foreign capital.

As Vice President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan told me, "We are moving in the right direction, but our pace is far too slow."

In the coming weeks, I intend to study India's manifold problems at close range on a tour that will take me from the high Himalayas down to the southern state of Kerala, where the Communists have come to power by exploiting the discontent of a suddenly impatient people.

#### *ARTICLE II. SOVIET SUCCESSES IN INDIA STRESSED DESCRIBING BIG CONSTRUCTION EFFORT, HARMAN SAYS RUSSIANS GET HEADLINES*

BHILAI, INDIA.—In less than 2 years, a task force of Russian engineers in pith helmets and khaki workclothes has helped transform this dot on the map of central India from a drowsy cluster of huts to a booming industrial community of 65,000 steel and construction workers.

They are assisting in the construction of a steel mill that is already producing pig iron and that by 1961 will have a capacity of

a million tons of steel, or one-sixth of the nation's planned output.

To make this project possible, the Soviet Government loaned India about half the total cost—\$140 million (at 2½ percent interest)—for the purchase of Russian equipment, and sent in 800 engineers and technicians who knew from experience at home or in China how to put up a modern steel plant from scratch.

As in China, these Russians have not tried to run the show; instead, they act as advisers and instructors to the Indian staff officially in charge. The result has been a smooth-working partnership based on mutual respect.

I talked at length with both Indians and Russians. The latter, with their wives and children, now number some 1,500. Relations seemed cordial but not intimate. (There is not much socializing.) These conscientious Russians were frankly homesick—they don't care for the hot climate—and eager to get on with the job. But they and the Indians shared a mutual enthusiasm for "our steel mill" that transcended differences in political ideology.

#### *Soviet aid is conspicuous*

Bhilai is a vivid symbol of India's determination to industrialize as rapidly as possible. It is also a symbol of Russia's decision to participate in India's development in a spectacular way. Although Soviet aid to India so far amounts to less than one-fifth of America's \$1,600 million worth of grants and credits, they are selecting projects, like Bhilai, that make headlines.

For example, the quiet and continuing efforts of U.S. agricultural experts to increase food production never receive the kind of publicity that the Russians get each time an Indian official cuts a ribbon to dedicate one of their new blast furnaces.

American aid is certainly appreciated by India's top leaders—who know how our shipments of food grains averted hunger and a serious inflation last year—but its impact on the people can be judged by recent public opinion polls that show a considerable number of Indians now think their biggest benefactor is the Soviet Union.

It can be argued that India is trying to do too much too soon, and that the emphasis right now should be less on building steel mills that employ relatively few people and more on increasing food production. The per capita daily calorie intake is only about 1,800. This is far too little, particularly in a nation where machines have not yet replaced muscles. And the population is growing at the rate of 6 million a year.

#### *Steel is a symbol*

But the argument is academic. The decision has been taken by India's planners to develop heavy industry. Two good crops a few years ago may have led them to understand the food problem, but in any case it would have been hard to resist the glamour of steel—which has become a symbol of economic independence in underdeveloped countries.

Thus, thanks to the Bhilai project, to two other government plants going up with British and German help and to the expansion of the great Tata works and other privately owned mills, India will soon be able to boast of a 6 million-ton-a-year steel industry, evenly divided between the private and public sectors.

For those who deduce from official statements that India is heading toward full nationalization, I might add that 90 percent of the industrial output outside of public utilities is still in private hands.

The men in charge of planning India's economic future told me that home-produced steel was essential for general industrial development and much-needed jobs for the millions of chronically unemployed. For instance, steel produced at Bhilai will be

cheaper than imported steel and will save India \$150 a ton in scarce foreign exchange.

As for food production, they point out that, with steel and heavy industry, India can build more fertilizer plants like the one I saw at Sindri, which already furnishes one-third of the Nation's present minimum needs.

#### Nineteen sixty breakthrough

India now requires a million additional tons of food grains each year—or \$100 million worth of imports—just to take care of her population increase. They estimate that these requirements can be more than met by building a \$44 million fertilizer plant each year for the next 5 years.

The goal of the planners is to achieve a breakthrough by the end of the third 5-year plan in 1966 that will not only double India's average per capita annual income of \$56, but transform India, in Nehru's phrase, "from an underdeveloped to a self-supporting nation"—that is, a prospering nation capable of obtaining its foreign exchange through trade and normal channels of credit and investment.

The 5-year plans may be overambitious; the second one is already running about 15 percent behind schedule. But you cannot blame those responsible for India's future for setting their sights high, and keeping them high. The plans not only spell out the kind of progress India's people are demanding from their government, but also give them something to look forward to.

Already, after only 12 years of independence, you can see everywhere that India's 400 million people are astride. In the villages, the dedication of the young community development officials is inspiring; and the new brick construction rising among the mud huts is a sign that farmers, no longer under the landlord's yoke, are developing a feeling of ownership and self-reliance.

Touring the Damodar Valley in eastern India, the source of 90 percent of the nation's coking coal, I was much impressed by the new dams and factories that are creating power, jobs, flood control and tillable land affecting millions of people. (Also impressive are the modern housing projects being erected by both private and public enterprises.) This Indian version of our TVA is costing \$250 million, but like its American model it will prove to be a priceless investment.

Meanwhile, it is no secret that India is desperately short of foreign exchange to tide her over the critical few years until the breakthrough.

Capital is hard to raise in a country where fewer than 500,000 families have taxable incomes above \$600 a year, and where 200 million live on no more than 10 cents a day. Capital has little chance to accumulate. In spite of that, most of the cost of the new development comes from Indian resources.

I asked India's top economic experts what they would need in loans from all countries to fulfill their plans. Estimates varied from \$2 billion to \$4 billion, spread over the third 5-year plan—preferably in long-term credits to make possible the import of required capital goods. (I am inclined to believe the higher figure is closer to the need, if only because pride and enthusiasm tend to make the experts underestimate their nation's problems.)

This is a lot of money. But it is still only 10 to 20 percent of the plan's projected costs. And with neighboring—and competitive—Red China, making its "great leap forward" through regimentation and the help of Soviet loans, India cannot afford to be leisurely about the future.

How far is the Soviet Union prepared to underwrite India's development as well? I hear it is negotiating to build plants to make heavy machinery, optical glass, and pharmaceuticals in different parts of India, just as it is now building Bhilai, and it ex-

pects to reap dividends of good will for itself and prestige for the Indian Communist Party.

This is the sort of competition the West is up against in India. Our disadvantage is the same as India's disadvantage vis-a-vis China: Democracies cannot move as swiftly (or as ruthlessly) as dictatorships.

When the Kremlin leaders were told by the Indian Ambassador that India had to have wheat to avert a famine in 1951, they were loading grain ships within 48 hours; our Government had been "studying" the question for months.

The fact that we later sent India 20 times as much wheat as did the Russians is not generally understood; they got the headlines.

India is a nation on the march. No visitor can fail to be impressed by the zeal with which her leaders are trying to overcome staggering economic and social problems. But zeal alone is not enough, for India's economy is like a plane taking off from a newly built runway—it can't afford to lose momentum or altitude.

#### ARTICLE III. HARRIMAN WARNS ON REDS IN INDIA, BUT SAYS REGIME IN KERALA MAY YET PROVE SPUR TO CAUSE OF DEMOCRACY

TRIVANDRUM, INDIA.—You don't have to be here long to find out that tropical little Kerala is in many ways unique among India's 14 states. It is first in population density (more than 1,000 people per square mile); first in literacy (more than 50 percent); first in the proportion of Christians (one-third since St. Thomas came here to spread the gospel in A.D. 52), and first in unemployment (1,600,000 out of a population of 13 million). Most important, it is also the first Indian state to have elected a Communist government.

Whether or not it will be the last to do so depends upon a number of factors: the kind of record the Communists make while they are in office; the extent to which the democratic parties face up to the Communist internal political threat, and the ability of the National Government to satisfy the expectations of India's 400 million people during the next few years.

Kerala's Communists were voted into power in 1957 with 35 percent of the vote against a divided and inept opposition. People were fed up with a succession of do-nothing or alleged corrupt administrations and dissatisfied because land reform had not been carried out. Many decided the Communists should be given a chance to deliver on their promises to get things done better and differently.

#### Comparisons with Europe

So I came down here both to see how they are doing and to learn whether they are any different from the Communists I knew in Europe and the Soviet Union.

It is immediately obvious that they are the same breed, taking their lead from Moscow. At first they tried rough tactics, intimidating their opponents and calling a political strike against the tea planters. Since this almost led to intervention by the Central Government—which is authorized by the Constitution to safeguard civil liberties—they have lately been behaving more carefully.

Today, Kerala's press is free—and 75 percent anti-Communist; the judges on the high court—to whom anyone may appeal—are appointed from New Delhi. But it is clear that the Communists are only biding time.

This emerged in the course of a revealing talk I had with Communist Chief Minister E. M. S. Namboodiripad. He had just returned from Moscow, where he was an important member of the Indian delegation to the 21st party congress. (In China, I am told, they already talk of the "two Indias"—Nehru's and Namboodiripad's.) I found him

affable but evasive. Each time I asked him why India's Communists did not press harder for a Soviet pattern of society—such as Chinese-style communes—he would reply, "not yet" or "not under the present circumstances."

Finally I suggested that India's democratic Constitution might be an obstacle. He agreed. So I pressed him: Would India's Communists change the Constitution and transform India into a true, tough people's democracy if they ever got the chance? Mr. Namboodiripad smiled broadly.

"Look at it this way," he said. "If a Hindu believes he will be reincarnated in his next life as a dog—does that mean he should start barking now?"

Kerala's Communists are not barking yet, but they are busy digging in, supporting the Communist labor unions, building a network of party workers that already reaches into most of Kerala's 30,000 villages.

Unable so far to fulfill their campaign promises—such as a 25-percent wage increase—they hope to win a decisive majority in the 1962 elections by means of a disciplined organization able to dispense patronage and favors, old-fashioned Tammany style, where they will do the most good.

What are their chances of holding Kerala and perhaps winning control of some other states? I think there are grounds for concern. It's true that the myth of Communist efficiency has been exploded here. Kerala's chronic food shortage and unemployment problems remain unsolved. Many people are disillusioned.

#### Many have grievances

University students, plantation workers, and educators all have grievances against the administration—the latter because of a new law giving the state greater control over private schools.

Nevertheless, I think it would be a mistake to underestimate the party's organizational efforts. More than 60,000 party members—many of them on a monthly payroll—are hard at work every day convincing people that this is their government. Party leaders are more accessible to the people than their predecessors and live more simply.

Although it is conceded they are personally honest, there are indications they are building up a substantial party war chest through manipulation of government contracts. They are also promoting farm and labor cooperatives to which contracts are given without competitive bids. They take credit for land reform. And when things go wrong they can always blame the Central Government in New Delhi.

Opinions differ as to the outcome of Kerala's next elections in 1962. Congress and Praja Socialist Party leaders, now ready to work together, believe they could upset the Communists' two-seat majority in the Assembly if the vote took place this year. But many fear that 3 more years of Communist entrenchment will make their job harder.

Meanwhile, the Communists told me they expected not only to hold Kerala but hoped to take over two or three other states.

Thanks to well-trained leaders and ample funds, their trade unions are growing in strength and influence at the expense of non-Communist labor groups, and if India's economy falters, the Communists are in a position to benefit from popular discontent.

#### Dangers recognized

Fortunately, India's leaders are aware of the dangers. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru himself is urging the Congress Party not to be complacent after 12 years in office—to press on with land reform, service cooperatives, local industries and community development programs.

There are strong factors working to reinforce democracy in India. The benefits of its 5-year plans are generally affecting more and more people; and I believe there is an



increasing awareness, particularly among intellectuals, that communism is the real enemy of India's democratic institutions.

In the long run, the Kerala experience may well prove to have been of value in stimulating India's democratic forces to greater efforts to preserve the freedoms and independence that India has so recently won.

#### ARTICLE IV. FOREIGN AID HELD CRUCIAL TO INDIA

NEW DELHI, INDIA.—At 69, Jawaharlal Nehru is, as ever, a man with a purpose. After devoting so many years of his life—including 13 in British jails—to securing India's political independence, his ambition today is to lead his country to what he calls economic independence. He hopes this will be accomplished during India's third 5-year plan, ending in 1966. And he has put aside any thoughts of retiring—even briefly—as he had proposed to do last year.

He told me this during our last talk together before I left India. I found his knowledge of even the details of India's economy impressive in a man burdened with so many responsibilities. And he does not underestimate India's enormous problems. As he remarked, "It takes an elephant a long time to get up."

There is no doubt that Nehru would welcome substantial U.S. aid to put the Indian elephant on its feet—that is, to make it possible to plan ahead with assurance for the third plan. But he is a proud man who does not like to ask directly for help. To my question about India's need, he replied, "A little foreign aid will only keep us where we are. To be really effective, foreign loans—from all sources—must be sufficient to get our economy off the ground. Now that we have built a sound base, we must make our economy dynamic and self-generating so that further expansion can come from our own resources."

Nehru calls himself a Socialist. But, as I observed, he is on record as saying that the state, which already wields great political power, should not also concentrate too much economic power in its hands. So I asked him about the future of private enterprise in India's planned economy. He replied that he was in favor of as much decentralization as possible, and that private industry could and should play an important part in the nation's development.

And what if the 5-year plans do not succeed? Would the Indian people turn to communism?

"Our people who vote Communist do so because they are disgruntled," he said. "So we must succeed."

#### Nehru prefers affirmative way

I told him that I had read his speeches and statements to intellectual groups in India stressing the basic difference between the Communist and democratic philosophies. But I wondered why he did not do more to explain to the mass of voters the real objectives of communism.

"It is not the Indian way," he said. "My attacking communism would do more harm than good. We must be affirmative. We must emphasize the human values of a free society and show our people what can be accomplished under democracy."

I leave India reassured that democracy is secure so long as Nehru is its leader. His power with the masses rests on an inspirational as well as a political foundation. He is trusted and revered as Gandhi's successor. But what will happen when he, too, goes?

Some Indians I have met believe that his absence would actually strengthen Indian democracy by releasing the energies of men whose initiative is overshadowed by Nehru's domination of all aspects of government policy. Others say that Nehru's leadership is essential for the next few years to prevent conservative elements taking over the Con-

gress party and slowing down the pace of the decisive third 5-year plan.

But I have found general agreement that democracy would survive Nehru. There are other men capable of taking over the reins.

#### India has four big problems

What really counts is whether the nation's economy develops fast enough to satisfy popular expectations. And right now, India faces four major problems, all of them interrelated:

The first is food. To provide adequate food for its growing population, India needs to increase its annual production of food grains from less than 70 million to at least 100 million tons by 1966. But to achieve this, the Government must not only teach farmers how to produce more but provide them with incentives so that they will want to produce more. These include price supports, better marketing and storage facilities, adequate credit, and better transportation. All this will require substantial investment, along with more fertilizer plants and irrigation, reclamation and flood control projects.

The second problem is employment. Tens of millions of people both in cities and villages are either unemployed or underemployed. To provide jobs for them, there is a need to stimulate both handicraft and small industries capable of making everything from cotton cloth to bicycles. These will also fill increasing demands for consumer goods and reduce India's dependence on imports. But this, too, will require investment as well as training.

Third, there is the growing political influence of the Communist Party. Though still small, with only 10 percent of the vote in 1957, it is the most disciplined and best organized opposition to the ruling Congress Party, and it capitalizes on popular discontent and lethargy among Congress leaders as well as in the labor unions. The lesson of Kerala State, where voters decided to give the Communists a chance to run things, may cause the Congress and Socialists Parties to bestir themselves. But the essential insurance against communism is social and economic progress. Democracy is safe if farmers get security of land tenure and incentive to produce, and if the "educated unemployed" of the cities no longer feel cheated by a society as yet unable to use their skills.

Finally, basic to all these problems is India's need of foreign exchange to buy the equipment and the materials for this rapid and revolutionary transition from an underdeveloped to a self-generating economy by 1966.

This need is estimated as between \$500 million and \$1 billion a year. Here is where the United States and other industrial nations can help with long-term loans which will permit India to go forward with confidence. As a Nation, we have already invested \$1,600 million in India's future. Now that we know it has been well used, the decision facing us today is whether we are prepared to do our share to help India finish the job.

As part of this investment, we should spend more money on our information program. The entire U.S. Information Service budget for India is only \$2,500,000 a year at a time when the Russians are spending at least this on publications alone. Our American representatives and technical advisers are doing a first rate job in India, but we need to expand our exchange program so that more Indian leaders and opinion makers can see America at first hand. (Those who come—and only 20 leader grants were available last year—invariably return impressed with what they have seen.) We need more up-to-date documentary films to reach a people still 80 percent illiterate. We cannot depend on Hollywood films to tell the real American story, for too many convey a distorted and unattractive image.

#### Leaders dedicated

One cannot travel from one end of India to the other, as I have for the past month, without being deeply impressed by the dedication of its leaders to the same principles of freedom and democracy to which we subscribe. Their policy of nonalignment is one that we should try to understand, remembering that for 150 years after independence we tried to isolate ourselves from the world's conflicts.

What happens in India is important to free men everywhere because the course of events in Asia will be decisively affected by India's ability to make democracy work in a revolutionary climate. Can it provide the food, the jobs, and the hopes for a better life that an awakened continent is demanding? And can it provide these things and freedom too? If not, there is little doubt that Asia will turn impatiently to Red China and accept regimentation as the only way to get things done.

The stakes are high in India today, but so is the price of failure.

#### Nehru hopeful for summit conference

In my discussion with Nehru we covered a wide range of world problems, including Canadian Liberal Leader Lester Pearson's suggestion that he, Nehru, call a summit conference. He replied that he didn't see how he could be helpful, but that he hoped a summit conference would take place. It was his opinion that Khrushchev definitely wanted to relieve tensions and find a way toward a reduction in armaments.

#### ARTICLE V. HARRIMAN URGES U.S. SHIFT IN ASIA

KARACHI, PAKISTAN.—In India I was asked the same question again and again: "Why are you sending Pakistan arms which will be used against us?" Now in Pakistan I get a completely different question: "We are your allies by treaty. Why do you send uncommitted India economic aid that helps them strengthen their army and threaten us?"

The Indian argument is that our military assistance to Pakistan, a member of SEATO and the Baghdad Pact, has forced them to divert badly needed resources to nearly double their military expenditures and thus indirectly offset the benefits of our aid. They claim that Pakistan is politically too unstable to be trusted not to attack.

The Pakistani fear is based on the widespread belief that India maintains its much larger army in order to dominate Moslem Pakistan. As a group of Pakistani newspapermen told me candidly: "We are your allies against communism, but the reason we need American weapons is to defend ourselves against India."

#### Both sides stress arms

This mutual fear and suspicion have led to heavy military expenditures in both of these hard-pressed countries. Two-thirds of the Pakistan national government's revenue now goes for military expenditures. This is why some \$900 million in U.S. aid—mostly grants and not counting military hardware—has gone largely to the military establishment rather than economic growth. And it has deeply disturbed India.

Since the assassination of Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan in 1951, Pakistan's problems have been aggravated by a succession of ineffectual governments. This led to a bloodless coup last October which set up a military dictatorship headed by Gen. Mohammad Ayub Khan. Although it is early yet to tell whether the new regime can carry out all its plans, I believe there is good reason for hoping that Pakistan may at last be on the road to political stability, economic progress and eventual democracy.

One reason for optimism is the personality of General Ayub himself. I found him an energetic, well-informed man, dedicated to

improving the life of his people. Ruling under martial law, one of his first moves was to put a stop to the graft and corruption which had long infested Pakistan's bureaucracy. He is also beginning to carry out a long talked of program to build decent housing for the 500,000 refugees now living in squalid hovels in Karachi. There is a new public sense of purpose and respect for government among Pakistan's 86 million people.

#### *Ayub for democracy*

In explaining the events that led to his seizure of power last fall, General Ayub told me, "It was not a question of dictatorship versus democracy, but of survival." So far, he considers his government's most important achievement has been to institute long delayed land reforms in West Pakistan which will free millions of farmers from the domination of feudal landlords and thus destroy the latter's political domination.

"This will make it possible to establish a democracy," he stated. I asked him how long it would take Pakistan to develop democratic institutions. He said that within 2 to 2½ years he hoped to have a constitution prepared by a commission to submit for popular ratification. He added that it should be modeled on ours, rather than the British, with a president with broad powers and a fixed term. But he thought, as do others in Asia, that election of top officials by direct popular vote is unrealistic in a young nation three-quarters illiterate; he suggested the possibility of a representative system of elections whereby the national executive and legislative officials would be chosen by locally-elected bodies—in effect, electoral colleges.

#### *Problem of river waters*

General Ayub made it plain that he believes Pakistan's overriding problem is India and that the essential first step in neighborly relations would be a settlement of the river waters question. This involves six rivers, three of which flow into west Pakistan from India. The Indian program for irrigation, by diverting water from presently irrigated lands, would strangle Pakistan. Until this issue is settled, Pakistan will continue to distrust India and rely on military strength.

Always in the background is the deadlocked dispute over the status of Kashmir. And then, there are minor border disputes still causing loss of life by military action on both sides. But General Ayub indicated that agreement on the river waters would end the most immediate threat, and other negotiations might follow. "We would gladly be reasonable if the Indians were," he told me, and suggested that the two countries might reduce their military expenditures and ultimately think in terms of common defense instead of defense against each other.

Coming from Pakistan's strong man, this attitude is a new and hopeful sign in a depressing situation. Unlike his predecessors, who often played on popular emotions to consolidate their power, General Ayub appears to be a man with the strength and self-assurance to be moderate. This year, for example, he became the first Pakistani leader to attend the annual celebration of India's national holiday at the Indian High Commission in Karachi. This gesture was favorably noted in New Delhi; it made it easier for Nehru to quiet the uproar in India this month when the new bilateral defense pact between Pakistan and the United States was signed.

The importance of better relations between these two countries, linked together by so much history, cannot be overestimated. They need to trade with each other. (For example, Pakistan should be obtaining more Indian coal instead of going as far afield as Poland and China; and India needs

Pakistan jute to keep its mills going.) As partners in the struggle for independence against British rule, they should now be partners in building up their countries and in preserving their freedom against the new colonialism of their Communist neighbors across the Himalayas.

Unhappily, U.S. policies have aggravated rather than eased the situation, and contributed to an arms race detrimental to both countries. In emphasizing the military, the Eisenhower administration has failed to appreciate the urgency of economic progress as democracy's best defense against Communist subversion in this area.

Right now, both sides think we should get tough with the other. The Indians want us to stop arms shipments to Pakistan. And, as one Pakistani told me, "American economic assistance to India should not only have strings attached, but a rope; not another penny until India settles its differences with your ally, Pakistan."

#### *Need to ease tensions*

It seems to me that all our efforts should be directed to reducing tensions between India and Pakistan, without antagonizing either side.

The most urgent problem is the issue of the river waters. During the past several years proposals have been made by the World Bank to help finance a canal construction program which would tie the six rivers together in such a way and under such agreements that both countries would get adequate water for their irrigation projects. But there are still disagreements about certain aspects of this program.

A settlement of this question, so vital to life in large areas of both countries, particularly Pakistan, would certainly relieve tensions and form a basis for future settlement of other disputes. After my talks in New Delhi and Karachi, I am satisfied that this is the year in which an agreement can be achieved. As friends of both India and Pakistan, our influence and help can play a decisive role.

#### LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959

MR. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Kennedy-Ervin so-called labor reform bill has been before the Senate only a few days, but the press of America has already recognized its deficiencies. Newspaper after newspaper has commented on the deficiencies of this approach, and I ask unanimous consent that several of these comments be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic, Mar. 28, 1959]

#### HALFWAY LABOR REFORM

On January 28 President Eisenhower sent Congress a message regarding proposed labor laws. He recommended legislation aimed at protecting union members as well as the public from unscrupulous union officials. This week, before adjourning for the Easter recess, the Senate Labor Committee approved a Democratic measure designed to protect rank-and-file union members. But the committee refused to sponsor the Republican-backed measures that would protect the public as well. Senator GOLDWATER was one of the minority members who refused to sign the committee report, and he will join Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, in a minority report.

Thus the stage has been set for a knock-down and drag-out fight on the floor of the

Senate when it reconvenes in about 10 days. The fight will not be over the so-called Kennedy bill, supported by everyone except a few union goons. The fight will be over the extension of labor reform measures to the broader field of protecting the public.

The Kennedy bill requires unions to make financial reports, to hold elections by secret ballots, to limit the terms of officers, to prohibit criminals from holding union offices, to limit an international union trusteeship to 18 months, and to ban picketing for purposes of extortion.

Most unions already have secret ballots, limited terms, etc. But the McClellan committee hearings found some in which officers were elected by a show of hands, assuring the victory to the candidate with the strongest arm. The hearings uncovered unions in which officers held office virtually for life, never being forced to run in an election.

In some cases international trusteeships of supposedly corrupt locals had existed for years without check.

Other unions had used millions of dollars in pension funds without making reports. Confirmed convicts were presidents of locals which had to pay dues to support their bosses in the flesh pots of Miami. All of these things are admittedly bad. The Kennedy bill may not cure them, but its provisions will give the rank-and-file union members the tools with which they can clean house if they wish to do so. The honest labor leaders support the Kennedy bill. So do President Eisenhower, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, Senator Goldwater, and the Republican Party.

But if Congress passes only the Kennedy bill it will be stopping half-way down the road to labor law reform. To travel the other half of the distance will require enactment of the provisions in the Goldwater bill, which would accomplish three major objectives.

First, it would strengthen existing laws on secondary boycotts by preventing coercion against an employer who is not directly engaged in a strike. Second, it would prevent "blackmail picketing," in cases where an employer already has recognized one union, or a representation election has been held in the past year, or when the picketing union cannot show that the employees it seeks to represent are interested in joining. Finally, in the so-called no man's land of industrial disputes, the Goldwater bill would permit the NLRB to decline cases it considers unimportant and would permit the States to assume jurisdiction in these cases.

Senator Kennedy agrees that there may be merit in some of these provisions, but he doesn't want to get them mixed up with the "democratization" legislation that his committee has approved. Most labor leaders simply don't want the Goldwater bill at all, since it would cut down their freedom of action in secondary boycotts, jurisdictional disputes, etc. So the Democratic bloc in Congress talks of passing the Kennedy bill now and getting to the Goldwater bill later. Most realists agree that if the two bills don't go together, the Goldwater amendments will be lost in the shuffle.

The post-Easter floor fight should be sharp and decisive. It will prove whether organized labor actually controls a majority of the votes in the Upper House. If the Goldwater amendments are killed, you will know that Reuther, Meany, et al., are calling the shots in the Senate.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Press, Mar. 12, 1959]

#### BILL OF PARTICULARS

Members of the Senate Labor Committee are working on legislation to curb the labor rackets exposed by the McClellan investiga-



tion. So far, the action does not point toward a very strong bill.

The reluctance of the Democrats on the committee, under pressure from the union lobby, to write a tight law is frightening, in view of the McClellan disclosures. Surely they can hear what Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the investigating committee, has been saying.

Just this week, in a New York speech, the Senator spelled out a bill of particulars in support of stronger measures he himself has proposed to correct the abuses revealed by his long inquiry.

"The instability or lack of integrity prevalent today in labor-management relations in this country is appalling," he said.

In the investigation "we have had to deal constantly with people of low character or no character at all." Of 1,200 witnesses so far summoned, more than 200 ducked behind the fifth amendment for fear of incriminating themselves. The evils which have been exposed, he said, "are outrageously cruel, corrupt, and contemptible."

"No legitimate union, properly administered by honest and decent officials, would be penalized to any extent or degree whatsoever," the Senator said. "If these provisions are enacted into law, however, the power and opportunity of crooked labor bosses and criminal elements to continue the abuse and exploitation of union members and working people in this country will be substantially curbed and reduced."

That's the issue: Whether union members and their families, the public, and decent union officials will be protected; or whether, by not passing such measures, Congress continues to protect the mobsters, thieves, extortionists, and murderers exposed by the McClellan committee.

How can any honest and decent union official, or Senators of like attributes, hesitate about on which side they stand?

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times, Mar. 14, 1959]

#### THE PUBLIC INTEREST COMES FIRST

President Meany of the AFL-CIO has denounced the Eisenhower administration's labor reform bill as stupid and antilabor. In testimony before the House Labor Subcommittee, he contended the administration bill represents a deliberate attempt to obscure the issues.

Mr. Meany favors—with some reservations—the Kennedy-Ervin bill introduced in the Senate. This deals mainly with protection of union funds and other safeguards against racketeering. The administration measure has similar provisions, but it would deal more severely with blackmail picketing. It proposes to ban picketing of a plant in the absence of evidence of sufficient interest in union membership among employees.

But there is a much more significant difference between the bills. This has to do with secondary boycotts. Despite the prohibition of the Taft-Hartley Act, it is possible for a union to force employers with whom it has no dispute to stop doing business with a concern against whom it has called a strike. The administration bill seeks to close Taft-Hartley loopholes which permit this abuse of union power; the Kennedy-Ervin measure would make no change in the existing Taft-Hartley provision.

The power to shut down businesses having no quarrel with a union in order to compel another business to bow to union demands has been used frequently to paralyze a whole industry or a whole section of the country. Under no circumstances can such monopoly power in the hands of labor leaders be defended as in the public interest. The public welfare must take precedence over union interest. To claim that legislation aimed at preserving that principle is antiunion is simply befogging the issue.

[From the Oakhurst (N.J.) Home News, Mar. 19, 1959]

#### WISHY-WASHY LABOR LAW

A new labor bill offered to Congress is practically the twin brother of the Kennedy-Ives bill of last session. The measure was pushed through the Senate on a hurry-up basis which allowed no time or opportunity for incentive hearings or consideration. It then was defeated in the House—for the simple reason that it just wasn't capable of doing the needed job.

There are good things in the currently proposed measure, just as there were in its predecessor. But the good is heavily outweighed by the negative aspect. To take one example, it would do nothing about two of the worst labor abuses perpetrated on business and the public—secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing.

Newspapers throughout the country are now asking for a stronger bill. An interesting instance is provided by the Richmond Times-Dispatch. The leading southern paper editorially rebuked the House for voting down the Kennedy-Ives bill, on the grounds that any law was better than none. But now it takes a different view. It calls the proposed law wishy-washy, and says: "This year the need to halt the inflationary wage-price spiral is even more urgent. The threat of sympathy strikes and secondary boycotts carries the full weight not only of the striking union, but also the threat inherent in the 16 million membership of the full AFL-CIO syndicate. Therein lies the greatest danger of union monopoly."

"The right to unionize, to bargain collectively and to strike locally should not be impaired (so long as public welfare and national security are not endangered). But unless the threat of nationwide strikes in key industries is removed, the inflationary trend cannot be checked."

The country has the right to a labor law which will protect the legitimate interest of us all, including union members. The Congress has the responsibility to pass such a law.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 17, 1959]

#### THE HALFWAY DEAL

It is our considered opinion that the majority of union bosses is opposed to any new laws in the labor field. But most of them publicly have accepted a minimum of reform legislation as the best device for fending off sterner measures.

As the Senate begins debate on this issue, the pattern is apparent. It is this: To pass what the union bosses will accept, but no more.

The Senate Labor Committee was completely in hand in this respect. It voted, 13 to 2, to report the Kennedy bill, which the union bosses have endorsed. It rejected all stiffening amendments.

Now the strategic excuses are being offered.

The Labor Committee report said only a few unions have been involved in the abuses exposed by the Senate's own special investigation for the McClellan committee.

Senator KENNEDY said any tougher legislation might lead to no legislation at all. It was he, too, who advised against any Federal laws against arson, assault or other violence—this, he said, being a responsibility of the States.

These things do not agree with the report of Senator MCCLELLAN, who has been in charge of the labor rackets investigation more than 2 years.

He said crookedness was prevalent. The list of crimes against union members and against the public fills volumes of testimony.

These crimes are no less vicious because they were not committed by honest union leaders. The reforms are not aimed at such

people—they are aimed at the mobsters, thieves, extortionists and even murderers Senator MCCLELLAN has been exposing.

And why is it local law enforcement machinery has not been adequate against crimes committed in the name of labor unions? It is because Congress by law has given them a power and a sanctity not enjoyed by other segments of society.

The abuses the McClellan committee has revealed were made possible by the privileges, without safeguards, which Congress bestowed indiscriminately on union bosses—by law. No halfway propositions can undo this damage.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1959]

#### LINE DRAWN FOR BATTLE

Against a background of bitterly contradictory assertions and the unusual spectacle of cosponsors of the pending legislation being in disagreement, the Senate has plunged into the controversial issue of labor reform.

First major test on the subject will come early next week when the Chamber will vote on an amendment offered by Senator ERVIN, North Carolina Democrat and cosponsor, to delete from the bill a section containing labor-approved revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. The disputed section, title VI, would permit displaced strikers to vote in representation elections and would loosen regulations on building trades unions. President Meany of the AFL-CIO already has threatened that the federation will oppose the bill if title VI is eliminated. Senator KENNEDY, Massachusetts Democrat and original sponsor of the legislation, has warned that any revision on the floor poses a grave risk of killing all prospect for reform action.

Along with this controversy within controversy, there is the broader dispute on whether the pending measure offers any effective reform at all. Mr. KENNEDY says it will do the job and that if passed "the Jimmy Hoffas and their ilk will be on the way out." Senator GOLDWATER, Arizona Republican, describes the Kennedy bill as completely inadequate and has offered an analysis critical of virtually every section. Senator MCCLELLAN, Arkansas Democrat whose special committee has uncovered some of the worst of the corrupt union practices, has offered five proposals—not in the Kennedy bill—which he says represent "the minimum that is required to provide an adequate legislative remedy for conditions that now prevail." Among the McClellan recommendations are prohibitions against secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing—two high-priority recommendations in the administration's labor reform program.

It is obvious that the political power of labor is apt to be the determining factor in whether there is to be reform legislation this year, and, if so, what its final shape will be. In the long term, however, labor's special interests are inextricably related to the general welfare rather than to the corrupt designs of those whom Senator MCCLELLAN has described as brutal, cynical men to whom unionism means only a royal road to personal riches and power. Whether in one legislative package or more, Congress should find the courage to serve these real interests.

[From the Boston Herald, Apr. 13, 1959]

#### HIS REFORM BILL QUESTIONED: KENNEDY RISKS BEING BEHOLDEN TO LABOR

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator JACK KENNEDY, front runner for the Democratic presidential nomination, owes his early lead to energy and a winning personality. But the way things are going, he could find himself more beholden to the American labor movement

than a successful candidate in America ought to be.

The prospects of three other presidential possibilities have been recently explored in this place. RICHARD NIXON's forte is experience and an open record; STUART SYMINGTON's is a proved ability in business management and labor relations; LYNDON JOHNSON's is leadership and parliamentary skill. But KENNEDY stands out as the favorite of the AFL-CIO, the spokesman for pro-labor legislation, and the gadfly of the pro-business opposition.

#### FRIENDLY WARNING

All this is confusing and unfortunate. Senator KENNEDY is not a laborite or a leftist. Nothing about him deserves the Republican epithets of "radical"—meaning in NIXON's language, an extremist. But it may be—and this is written in friendship and warning—that KENNEDY and his backers don't realize how far toward the precipice the Senator's labor reform bill (S. 505) is taking them.

The Senator, for example, has been forced by competition to take a position which opposes making union officers criminally responsible for misusing union funds. True, the Kennedy bill does not blacklist "fiduciary responsibility," which is the legal phrase. But of the four principal labor reform bills now before Congress, only the Kennedy bill fails to include a fiduciary provision.

The Kennedy bill is much softer than its three competitors in the matter of financial disclosure by union officers. The Kennedy measure relies on criminal procedures, while the Goldwater-administration bill (S. 748) would provide actions of disapproval by the Labor Department and the National Labor Relations Board. Two other bills by Senator McCLELLAN (S. 1137) and Congressman BARDEN (H.R. 4473) go still further. They require that the union financial reports be certified by a certified public accountant.

KENNEDY's bill includes a difficult legal obstacle for the removal of a union officer by vote of the union members. There is a "show cause" phrase in the Kennedy bill which is significantly left out of the bill by McCLELLAN, whose committee has interviewed so many slippery characters. Again, the Kennedy bill is unlike the bills by Goldwater, McCLELLAN, and BARDEN in the matter of protecting union members from threats and violence by union officers and goons.

#### FOR FEDERAL SWAP

The Kennedy bill tends to federalize jurisdiction over labor affairs which now lie in the no-man's land between Washington and the States. Two of the other three bills favor States rights when in doubt and the fourth bill does not take up the subject. The Kennedy bill deals very gingerly with labor picketing and deals not at all with secondary boycotts, two matters on which the AFL-CIO is very touchy.

In virtually every case KENNEDY does what the labor leaders desire, or will tolerate, and what the business community regards as undesirable and often intolerable. This may not be so bad. Labor is entitled to liberal champions in Congress, but there is reason to feel that some of the KENNEDY positions are harmful not merely to business, but to the public interests. This appears to be true in places where the Kennedy bill fails to go as far in protective language as the McClellan bill.

#### THE POLITICAL SCENE: CONGRESS WON'T HALT UNION CRIME

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The American people may not realize it yet, but the Congress isn't going to do anything at this session that really will put an end to the racketeering in labor

unions. This is already conceded privately by the leaders on both sides.

Actually, none of the proposed measures, even if passed, would eliminate the corruption that has been exposed at the hearings conducted by Senator McCLELLAN and his committee.

One of the most significant comments has just come from George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. In an interview in the current issue of *Dun's Review and Modern Industry*, Mr. Meany pointed out that the unions alone cannot stop the abuses. Here is an excerpt:

Question. Do you believe that the labor legislation now pending in the Congress will provide adequate power to curb these abuses?

Answer. Adequate power? Frankly, these abuses could not be stopped by the unions alone. The trade-union movement is trying to do what it can in this field. We think we have some moral responsibility to do this. But the AFL-CIO has no legal responsibility to curb corruption in union locals. We aren't a law-enforcement agency, and we don't have the power of subpoena. We couldn't possibly call a trade-union official before our council and say, "We are suspicious; we don't like the way things are going." Certainly, we would not hesitate to take action where we had proof of wrongdoing or corruption. But we must have the proof, and we haven't got the machinery to go out and make these investigations.

So, to answer your question, we don't feel that the requirements of the Kennedy-Ervin bill would eliminate corruption. We do think it would curb some of these people because they will have to report all their financial transactions. We think the Kennedy-Ervin bill is a step in the right direction, but the real problem of corruption is the failure of the law enforcement authorities to act. The jukebox and coin-machine business points it up quite clearly. Here's one of our big industries, in the billion-dollar class, and it's honeycombed with gangsters and thugs operating with the connivance of greedy businessmen and with the cognizance of the law enforcement authorities.

"It is quite obvious that the real answer to corruption, whether in unions or anywhere else, is better law enforcement. Nobody runs to the American Bankers Association every time a cashier defaults or somebody on the inside robs a bank—they expect the local district attorney to handle that. When companies engage in business frauds, nobody runs to the chamber of commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers and says, 'What are you going to do about law enforcement?' No, they expect the local district attorney to do it."

This correspondent read the foregoing quotation to Senator McCLELLAN and asked him for his opinion on it. The Arkansas Senator said:

"They say they do not have the power, and that is correct. They can't stop a Hoffa. That's why laws are needed. If they had the power, and would be diligent in exercising it, we probably wouldn't need additional laws, or so many laws. But they cannot deal with people like Hoffa, and it's imperative that we enact laws to at least curb—you never completely prevent crime of any kind."

Question. "I wonder why the local district attorneys haven't done more on this?"

Answer. "I think the simple answer to that is, politics. They control—just like they control an industry or control an operation. They have the political power where they control often the people in public office."

Question. "You mean the unions do?"

Answer. "Sure. Or the union racketeers—that element in them. There's no question about that."

All this points up to the fact that labor unions are not at all analogous to trade associations or groups of businesses. The labor unions have a monopoly power. They get it out of existing laws and also out of the refusal of Congress to include labor unions as within the jurisdiction of antimonopoly or antitrust laws.

Labor unions have not only a monopoly power in being able to fix wages in an entire industry, but they have a monopoly power with respect to memberships. In some lines, they can prevent an applicant from getting a job. They can force a member out of a union through various devices and deprive him of his means of livelihood. This type of potential coercion makes it difficult for anyone who is aware of corruption to give testimony to the law enforcement authorities for fear of punishment by union officials. No such power over the individual is held by any other trade organization or private association of any kind.

Obviously, it is the duty of States to preserve order and punish crimes within their borders. But when wrongdoing is of an interstate character—and virtually all the unions have been placed under interstate commerce by acts of Congress and by judicial decisions—it would appear that ultimately Federal legislation will be necessary. In fact, Congress enacted several years ago the first of its antiracketeering statutes, and these have never been held to be an improper exercise of Federal authority.

[From the Washington Courthouse (Ohio) Record-Herald, Mar. 23, 1959]

#### PRESENT LABOR BILLS IGNORING REAL EVILS

People of almost every community in the country have a decided interest in what transpires in this session of Congress with reference to labor bills—particularly in regard to the monopolistic power of the big union labor organizations.

Two labor bills are now before Congress. One is the administration's bill, the other is known as the Kennedy-Ives bill which was defeated by the House of Representatives last year.

The primary purpose of these two proposals before Congress at this time seems to be to protect the rank-and-file union membership from corrupt union officials. The sordid revelations produced by the McClellan committee's investigations into labor racketeering have demonstrated a crying need for that, even though this touches only a part of the labor trouble.

The other side, one of vital and perhaps even more importance in the long view, was recently dealt with by Henry Hazlitt in one of his *Newsweek* columns. He writes: "The two labor bills \* \* \* merely serve to deflect public attention away from the real evils of uncurbed union power. They seem to be drafted mainly on the assumption that labor bosses can do no wrong except to union members. The plight of nonunion workers, employers, and the consuming public is largely ignored. The central evils of legalized violence and monopolistic compulsion are left untouched."

The general public, which more and more has been noting the extremes to which various big labor leaders have been going, undoubtedly is inclined to agree with Mr. Hazlitt when he adds that "real steps to reform would be amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act to remove the exclusive bargaining powers granted to unions, and to prohibit all devices that tie employment to union membership."

In other words, if every form of corruption, dishonesty, and unethical practices within the unions disappeared tomorrow, and if all union affairs were administered on a level of unquestioned purity with reference to leaders' treatment of union members, really important abuses would remain.



Union monopoly and the union power to coerce and dictate, are left untouched by the proposed laws. No law in this connection, is now before Congress which pays more than feeble lip service to the real public interest.

Years ago when that sort of thing was happening in big business with its monopolistic activities, corrective legislation was speedily passed to curtail abuses. Why should the now powerful labor organizations not be treated in the same manner for the sake of public welfare?

#### LOCAL INITIATIVE AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IS REVITALIZING ROCHESTER, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the growing challenges confronting our Nation is that of the future of our urban centers. The increasing demand for services by city dwellers, their increasing cost, and the decay of many downtown areas across the land, have posed tremendous problems for our larger cities. The reaction to such situations has varied from place to place.

Some cities have turned immediately to the Federal Government for assistance. Others have taken the view that State governments should do whatever rebuilding is needed. Finally, a great many cities have decided that this is a problem they themselves must face squarely; that this is a challenge which must be answered by local leadership, local financing, and local action.

A splendid case in point is Rochester, N.Y. In the post-World War II years the city has taken a number of progressive steps to revitalize its downtown area, to eradicate slums and architectural decay, and rebuild a city of which all residents can be proud.

It is important to note that the already outstanding results are largely the product of local leadership and funds and increasingly vigorous support from private enterprise sources. Enlightened cooperation of all parties concerned, based on voluntary compliance and good, plain, hard work, has paid rich dividends.

The city's downtown is now literally a place reborn, a showplace other cities of our Nation could well study and emulate. My hat is off to the governmental and civic leaders who have produced this modern-day miracle. They have demonstrated that not all the answers to local problems must be sought in Albany or Washington.

The story of Rochester's rehabilitation program was graphically outlined recently by Robert P. Aex, the city's city manager, and one of the stalwarts in this surge of progress. In an article published in the March issue of New York State Taxpayer, he tells something of the ingredients which went into this successful municipal improvement program. It is fitting that Mr. Aex's remarks should be printed in this publication, for its sponsor, the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, has long stood in the forefront of efforts to limit extravagance in government spending and insure that each taxpayer receives the maximum benefits for his tax contributions. I ask unanimous consent that

this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ROCHESTER CITY MANAGER TRACES STEPS IN DOWNTOWN REHABILITATION PROGRAM

(By Robert P. Aex, city manager of Rochester)

Rochester, the third largest city in New York State, is a typical eastern city which has grown old and has been showing the signs of old age. The community was settled almost 150 years ago, and Rochester became an incorporated city 125 years ago.

According to Blake McKelvey, city historian, the rapidity of Rochester's growth in the 1820's made it America's first boomtown. The blooming gardens, attractive cottages and pretentious mansions in Rochester in post-Civil War days attracted many visitors.

By 1890, visitors were displaying even a greater interest in the remarkably simple Kodak of the Eastman Kodak Co. By the turn of the century, Rochester was known as the Kodak city.

After 100 years of prosperous growth and development, Rochester decided it needed modernization. Ten years ago, the city undertook the most ambitious public improvement in its history. This program was aimed at modernizing municipal service and encouraging private enterprise to act in a downtown redevelopment program.

#### ARTERIAL HIGHWAYS

The construction of new arterial highways has been authorized each year since 1950. Rochester's arterial highway program includes the construction of an inner loop which circles the central downtown business district and an outer loop which circles the city. Connecting links between the inner loop and the outer loop complete the plan for a new arterial highway system to serve the city and the metropolitan area.

#### OFFSTREET PARKING

The population in the metropolitan area extends far beyond the reaches of the public transit system. Therefore, the municipal improvement program for revitalizing the downtown area includes the construction of places for people to park their cars after they have used the new highways to get downtown.

Modern parking accommodations in the form of parking ramps today provide deluxe parking service at reasonable rates. Rates are as low as 5 cents per hour.

One parking ramp, a 523-car, eight-level unit, handled 65,000 cars in the 4 weeks between Thanksgiving and Christmas 1958. Every car contained a shopper because long-term parking is prohibited.

#### CIVIC CENTER

In July 1954, the governments of the city of Rochester and the county of Monroe approved a site in the downtown area for a proposed city-county civic center in an area of the city which had deteriorated in recent years.

The completion of the Civic Center which is already under construction, will bring the units of city and county government together in one place and will greatly aid and improve the administration of local government for both the city and the county.

#### REHABILITATION

The rehabilitation of individual homes, old streets, and even whole sections of the city was undertaken by the city's rehabilitation commission in 1955. A hygiene of housing ordinance was adopted and residential rehabilitation throughout the city has progressed at a rapid rate.

The key to the rehabilitation program is voluntary compliance by landlords, but the housing ordinance has teeth in it which can be used when necessary. In 1957, Rochester was selected as one of the nine cities in the United States with a most outstanding rehabilitation program, and it received a Home Achievement Award from Look magazine.

Rochester's downtown redevelopment program is based upon the belief that private enterprise must play the major role in the demolition of old structures and the building of new ones. The municipal improvement program, ambitious as it is, would never be sufficient to do the job. Even with State and Federal aid, there would not be enough local tax resources to underwrite such a program.

Slowly, but steadily, private enterprise has responded. New buildings have been constructed in the downtown area, and old buildings have been remodeled and restored.

#### MIDTOWN PLAZA PROJECT

On September 26, 1958, local newspapers announced a private enterprise project called Midtown Plaza (see October 1958 Taxpayer). It is geared toward revitalizing downtown Rochester and checking the decentralization of shopping. Midtown Plaza is unique in that it is basically an urban renewal project by private enterprise without government subsidy.

The project anticipates the expansion of the present McCurdy & Co. and B. Forman Co. retail stores, 25 or 30 new retail shops, an 18-story office building and a bus terminal. All this is to be designed, constructed and financed by private enterprise. All land required for the shopping plaza has been acquired by the private interests.

The city's cooperation in the Midtown project has been carefully studied. The municipal investment in the construction of streets, relocation of water lines and sewers, and an underground garage has been evaluated as "self-liquidating."

#### NEW HOTEL

On January 10, 1959, the Hotel Corp. of America announced its intention to construct a new \$6 million hotel in Rochester.

The additional revenue in taxes which the city government, the city schools and the county government will receive from the private construction in Midtown Plaza and the new hotel removes all doubt as to whether the municipal projects, undertaken in cooperation with the private Midtown Plaza project, will be self-liquidating.

When the proposed new hotel was announced, Mayor Peter Barry said, "The announcement of a new hotel of a different type for downtown Rochester is exactly the type of result for which we have been working. It is this sort of private investment and renewal of our commercial area which we feel will bring about a literal rebirth of Rochester's downtown."

#### THE BYELORUSSIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the 25th of March 1918, there came into being a free republic known as the Byelorussian National Republic. Its life was very, very short indeed. It was then consolidated and incorporated in the Soviet Union.

The arrival of March 25 each year does call attention to and does bring to mind the rich contributions which the citizens of Byelorussian descent in this country have made to the cultural heritage of this Republic. Here, as elsewhere, they have striven to keep alive their traditions and their unquenchable love of

freedom; and in doing so they have contributed greatly to the lives of all Americans.

Mr. President—  
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

#### CHRISTIAN ARCHIBALD HERTER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the new Secretary of State, Christian Archibald Herter.

The new Secretary of State is 64. He was born on March 28, 1895. At his birth, Grover Cleveland was in the White House and Adlai Stevenson, Sr., presided over the Senate. Mr. Herter was born in Paris. Both his father and mother were artists. He received his preparatory education in France and returned to the United States to graduate from Harvard cum laude in 1915.

His ambition was to be an architect. He abandoned his course and joined the Foreign Service as an Embassy attaché in Berlin in 1916.

Being too tall for his weight, he was rejected for military service in World War I and became a special assistant in the State Department in 1917.

Few persons have had such a variety of experience to equip them for the duties which Chris Herter is now called upon to assume.

He negotiated a prisoner-of-war agreement with Germany after World War I. He was Secretary to our Peace Mission in Paris in 1918-19. In 1919, he became Secretary to the American Relief Administration under Herbert Hoover. He became Executive Secretary of the European Relief Council. He fought communism with food for refugees and prisoners of war. When Herbert Hoover became Secretary of Commerce in 1921, Chris Herter was chosen as his assistant.

For a number of years he was a publisher, editor, and lecturer, and lectured at Harvard on international relations in 1929 and 1930.

In 1931, public service claimed him again.

For 12 years, he served in the Massachusetts General Court or Assembly and was selected speaker of the house for 4 years. Then came four terms in Congress. In his first election he won by 2,900; in his fourth election, he won by 67,000. I served with Chris Herter in the House.

In 1947, Chris Herter proposed to Congress a Select Committee on European Aid to get first-hand information on the proposal of General Marshall, then Secretary of State for a Marshall plan. I saw Chris Herter's work in Europe and can testify to the skillful approach he made to this problem. I was chairman of a committee in Europe at the time.

From Congress, Chris Herter went to the governorship of Massachusetts for two terms. Thereafter he came to Washington as Under Secretary of State and took over those duties in February of 1957.

He is the father of 4 children, the grandfather of 12, and holds honorary degrees from 16 universities.

Many Members of the Senate served with Chris Herter when he was in the House of Representatives. This we know of him: He is a scholar. He is thorough. He has the background and talent for his new responsibilities. He possesses that most uncommon of all virtues, common sense. He is a dedicated patriot. He is friendly. He has moral courage and he will serve honorably and with distinction in the finest tradition of those who have preceded him as Secretaries of State, from Thomas Jefferson to John Foster Dulles.

#### JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when I heard of Secretary Dulles' resignation and the appointment of Mr. Herter, I issued a news release in relation to Mr. Herter. As has been stated, he is a man of character and ability. This he demonstrated in the House of Representatives and as Governor of a great State. He demonstrated it again, sitting at the feet of one of the greatest men America has produced, John Foster Dulles.

An editorial entitled "A Fighter for Freedom Retires," was published in Business Week of April 18, 1959. It reads in part as follows:

With the resignation of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the free world has lost the invaluable services of one of its most powerful and effective advocates. His task, as he saw it, was to preserve peace and freedom in the world. And to that high purpose, Dulles selflessly devoted his vast knowledge and boundless energy.

I ask that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM RETIRES

With the resignation of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the free world has lost the invaluable services of one of its most powerful and effective advocates. His task, as he saw it, was to preserve peace and freedom in the world. And to that high purpose, Dulles selflessly devoted his vast knowledge and boundless energy.

Although controversy raged about him much of the time, he pursued his labors with the calm, relentless air of a man who had dedicated himself to a just cause and intended to follow the path of duty wherever it might lead. It was this quality, no less than his exacting mind and wide experience in foreign affairs, that gave him the unchallenged leadership of the West in the worldwide struggle against Communist expansion.

Dulles has never faltered in his belief that the free world must meet Soviet aggression with boldness and courage, that appeasement would only increase the danger of war. From his knowledge of the origins of World Wars I and II, he derived a strong conviction that the Communists must never be left in any doubt about our capacity, and our will, to meet any outright aggression with force.

His formulation of this policy frequently frightened the timid and less farsighted. His phrase "massive retaliation" aroused a furor at home and abroad among many who failed to realize that Dulles was talking the only language the Communists could understand. When he frankly said that in dealing with such a foe we had to be ready to go to the brink of war, his enemies used the

epithet "brinkmanship" in an effort to tear him down. Yet, today, it is generally recognized that Communist ambitions can be held in check only by our retaliatory power and by our determination to use it as a last resort rather than to surrender our principles.

For all his toughness, Dulles has never been a warmonger. At least once, in his early days in office, the idea of preventive war was presented to him as a possible answer to the Soviet menace. He rejected such a course as repugnant to the whole American tradition. He has been convinced that if the United States maintained both its power and its principles, we could win the East-West struggle without subjecting the world to a holocaust. And his record proves what a master he was in the difficult art of keeping an appropriate balance between power and principle—the two essential attributes of an effective foreign policy in a democratic nation.

If Dulles often seemed rigid in his diplomatic approach, it was not because he was inflexible, as so often charged. In beginning to prepare the U.S. position on Berlin, just before he was stricken down, he showed himself ready for a flexible approach to Soviet demands—one that would allow for the power realities in Berlin and still preserve basic Western rights there.

Like many another American Secretary of State before him, Dulles has had to bear the slings and arrows of partisan attack at home. From abroad he has had to meet a constant stream of poisonous propaganda from the foe and more than a few malicious barbs from our allies. Fortunately, he always has had the unfailing support of President Eisenhower. And though he may have been prone to run a one-man show at the State Department, he also has had the loyal support of an able group of assistants.

Perhaps the most extraordinary tribute to Dulles came when the nature of his illness was revealed some 2 months ago. Almost overnight his detractors began to speak and write of him as an "indispensable man."

To serve his country and his fellow men everywhere, Dulles has given of his strength without stint. He has earned the respect and gratitude of all Americans. He has set a standard of devotion to duty and high principle that will be an inspiration for those who must now take up the unfinished business of securing peace and freedom in the world.

#### THE PASSING OF AN ERA IN AMERICAN HISTORY—DEATH OF CHIEF TOMMY THOMPSON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Chief Tommy Thompson of the Wy'am Indian tribe was born 5 years before statehood was achieved by my home State in 1859. During the 105 years of his life, Chief Tommy Thompson saw the culture of his people run the full course from the primitive to the present day. He did not approve of all that he saw. He disliked many of the changes from tribal ways.

Chief Tommy also was an outspoken protector of his people's treaty rights. He opposed to the end the loss of fishing rights at Celilo Falls on the Columbia River, where the Dalles Dam flooded out an ancient fishing site. Members of his tribe will long remember his efforts on their behalf. And others who knew of his devotion to his position as tribal Indian chief will long respect the manner in which he discharged those responsibilities.



I ask consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD some informative editorials and news stories from Oregon newspapers about the death of Chief Tommy Thompson.

The editorials are from the Journal of Portland and the Statesman of Salem; the articles are written by Mrs. Ann Sullivan for the Oregonian, of Portland, and by Robert C. Hall, of Hood River, for the Journal. They fill in background on an epoch now closing in the annals of the Oregon country.

There being no objection, the editorials and news stories were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salem Statesman, Apr. 15, 1959]

#### DEATH OF AN INDIAN CHIEF

Tommy Thompson filled the role of Indian chief, an authentic one too, for many decades, but at last, at age 104, he was called to the "happy fishing grounds" where fat salmon fresh from the sea are not cut off by white men's nets or dams—or laws. Chief Tommy was head of the small band of Wy'am Indians who clustered at Celilo Falls on the Columbia, falls now smothered by the impounded waters of the Columbia.

Chief Tommy was born on the banks of the great river of the West and died at nearby Hood River. He will be buried in the Indian cemetery on the bluffs overlooking the river where, in his lifetime, he saw railroads come, and highways with fast automobiles, saw giant man-guided birds fly in the airway of the Gorge and stubby tugs dragging barges replace the steamers *Bailey Gatzert* and *T. J. Potter*. He saw, in short, the passing of the pioneer stage of the white race in the Northwest and the ushering in of the industrial age, saw the accommodation of the Indians, painful and slow, to the white men's ways. In time his title of chief became honorary as the diminishing tribal authority passed to tribal councils; but he was venerated by the tribesmen for his title and his years and his loyalty to his band. They will accord him honors deriving from old custom in the funeral ceremonies attending his interment.

[From the Oregonian, Apr. 15, 1959]

#### INDIAN DRUMS, VOICES PAY HOMAGE TO CHIEF TOMMY THOMPSON

(By Ann Sullivan)

Indians from many places in the Northwest, particularly Warm Springs and Yakima, have gathered at Celilo Falls to pay homage to beloved old Tommy Kuni Thompson, the last of the hereditary chiefs in Oregon. He died Sunday at Hood River.

The colorful centenarian, who was believed to be almost 105, was carried from the Anderson Mortuary in Hood River early Tuesday evening, dressed in pure white new buckskins, devoid of ornament.

He was taken in darkness past the gleaming, whirling massiveness of the Dalles Dam which he bitterly opposed and which in life he had declined to look at. His body, wrapped in some 10 fine Pendleton blankets was placed on top of his handsome, ornate beaded chieftain's trappings in a cedar coffin. They go with him to a world beyond with which he had long communicated through his holy bird, Pi-a-toot Ka-ke-a.

The bronze dove, a gift of the U.S. Army Engineers, is a replica of the little wooden bird which Tommy Kuni ("he who is full of knowledge") carved when he became chief of the Wy'ams about the time he was full grown. The bird customarily was mounted on his La-wit, or prayer pole in front of the long house of the old Celilo village. It always faced east—to the sun.

When the sun rose so that the shadow of the bird fell on the ground through the eastward opening of the long house, it was

always time for the annual spring salmon festival, a time of rejoicing for the Indians, for the return of the bountiful food fish to spawn up the river.

It is almost that time now, but there has been no announcement of a festival, for gone are the ages-old fishing grounds.

Until midnight Tuesday, relatives and friends of the old chief gathered around his body in its casket in the new long house, thrumming drums and chanting Indian songs in his honor, recounting his bravery and wonderful things he was in life.

The large cedar casket was made by hand—as Chief Tommy had requested—by some of the Indians at Warm Springs. It was trucked to Celilo Tuesday, and the chief's body placed in it. The outside is varnished, and inside it is painted a sky blue—"when the dawn and the sun meet together."

The chief's widow, tiny Flora Thompson, who is about 60 years old (she married him about 10 years ago), helped dress him at the funeral home Tuesday.

She said that his fine, eagle feathered headdress will stay behind him, and that the only symbol of his chieftainship will be a single eagle feather in his hand.

The Indians at the funeral which is called "ni-cha-tut," had a snack supper at midnight and retired to rest until Wednesday morning, when they will again take up their homages.

This time the chanting and the drums will go on throughout the night, with the burial scheduled as near dawn as possible, as the chief had wished.

Mrs. Thompson said that it might not be until 8 or 9 a.m. because of difficulty of traversing the distance to the little old cemetery long used by the Celilos on the bluff overlooking the river. Railroad excavation long ago wiped out the road, so the National Guard has volunteered the use of heavy vehicles to traverse the neighboring farmer's land to reach the cemetery.

[From the Oregon Journal, Apr. 15, 1959]

#### CHIEF TOMMY'S MEMORY A REPROACH

Chief Tommy Thompson of the Wy'am Indians was born in a tepee by the roaring waters of Celilo Falls.

For more than a century he lived within earshot of the sound. The roar has disappeared with the drowning of the Celilo rocks by the Dalles Dam pool. Now Chief Tommy has gone, at age 105, his last few years spent, sadly, in a nursing home.

His memory must always be a reproach to the white man. He saw the coming of the white settlers and the transition of a raw frontier into what we call civilization. He became a friend of the whites, but never did he accept their ways.

He resisted to the end the loss of the Celilo fishing rocks, which destroyed forever the colorful way of life of his people.

He did not consider money a substitute for salmon, and he refused personally to accept the pay offered each member of his tribe by the Federal Government for the loss of the fishing rights. Neither he nor anyone in his tribe participated in the agreement which signed away those rights, for his people's ancient claim was vague and hard to prove. "I have not signified away my salmon," he was fond of saying.

Chief Tommy's body, wrapped in robes made especially for him and lying in a casket hewn from a single cedar log, will rest on the high shore of the Columbia near where he lived out his years.

The spot will be remembered not only by the people of his vanishing tribe but by many white persons who were his special friends and who vainly championed his cause.

Many other whites accept the inevitability of the great hydroelectric development at The Dalles but are a little uneasy in their

consciences over the memory of what it did to Chief Tommy and his people.

They are not helped by the further knowledge that the overall record of the white men's dealings with the Indians over the decades is not one of which to be proud.

[From the Oregon Journal Apr. 14, 1959]  
PLANS FOR INDIAN CHIEF TOMMY THOMPSON'S FUNERAL REVEALED; ANCIENT TRIBAL RIGHTS, SAD CHANTS DUE IN ALL-NIGHT WY'AM RITUAL

(By Bob C. Hall)

HOOD RIVER, April 14.—Chief Tommy Thompson, last of the great Columbia River chiefs, died Sunday night at his home near Celilo, the Indian fishing village on the Columbia where his tribe had lived for centuries. His family said he was close to 105 years of age.

The old chief of the Wy'am Indians (popularly called the Celilo Tribe after the steam boat *Celilo* that plied the river to that port of call) spanned a century of Oregon history. The ceremonials to be held over his body Tuesday and Wednesday nights will follow, to the letter, the rites which he himself had presided over, since the late 19th century.

Only a few whites will be among the Wy'am people to gather at "the long house" where Chief Thompson presided over the affairs of his people as they skewered and later netted the mighty salmon that traversed the Celilo cataracts.

Now the Dalles Dam has buried that world-famed tourist site, the railroads and highways have all but obliterated the historic Wy'am village there. But the long house still stands, and there the dead chief will receive the final tribute from his people.

Clad in white buckskin, the traditional attire for a dead chief on his way to the hereafter, with three eagle feathers in his hand, Chief Thompson is to lie in state today, while family and friends gather for the all-night ritual.

Then, circling the big cedar casket one by one, the tribe will chant their individual eulogies—a symbol of their friendship as they walk him to paradise. Each chanter steps out to let the next one step in after a brief "walk" so that only the dead chief travels all the way. The others move away lest they, too, be taken into the hereafter.

Wednesday night the tribe will carry their dead chief to the burial ground that lays on the windblown bluff high above the Celilo village. Ironically, they may have to ask a white man's permission to reach their cemetery. The old access road was ruined by white man's construction and the only route now passes through a farmer's private land.

Among the mourners will be the white woman who is closer to the tribe than any other nontribe member. She is Martha Ferguson McKeown, Willamette University graduate and teacher at Hood River's Wy'-east High School. Mrs. McKeown and her late husband, Archie, spent several years before his death photographing and recording the peculiar life of the Celilo fishing Indians.

Out of that research has come two remarkable children's books, alternate pages of Mrs. McKeown's writings and Mr. McKeown's black and white photographs. The second of these, "Come to Our Salmon Feast," was released to the public by publishers Binfords & Mort, Portland, last week.

Mrs. McKeown, now an adopted daughter of Chief Thompson, and virtually his guardian in recent years, says the old chief was delighted with the new book, which she read to him last week. The book takes its title from a custom Chief Thompson had made a moral obligation, almost to his undoing.

Says Mrs. McKeown, "You see, when the original treaty, allowing the Wy'am to fish the Celilo Rapids, was signed by the participating tribes—Chief Thompson did not

sign the agreement—he was told that the people were his responsibility and that he had to provide for them.

"So each year he held a giant feast just after the peak of the salmon fishing season. Then, with he and his family occupying the choicest fishing rock at Celilo, the fish were easy to come by and the feast was always a great event of the year.

"But lately, with the rapids gone—under the Dalles Dam Reservoir—it had practically ruined him to provide all that fish—yet he kept at it, insisting that this was his obligation."

Such an adherence to tradition was the dominating feature of Chief Thompson's life—a life which saw the final days of Indian glory in Oregon and ended in virtual slavery to the conquering whites.

A young boy when the first Indian treaties were signed, Chief Thompson grew up among a tribe that never fought the white man, served as scouts for the soldiers quartered at Fort Dalles.

His uncle, Chief Stoecketti, was killed on a scouting mission. Young Kuni took over the chief's role, then, later changed his name to Tommy Thompson after the explorer David Thompson. In his way he showed his intent to live peaceably beside the ancient fishing grounds, among the new white settlers.

But Indian treaties were, it seemed to the chief, made to be broken. The first Indian treaty of 1855 drew out the boundaries of Indian fishing rights. Another treaty in 1865 limited them still, and taught the Wy'ams a lesson in white diplomacy. As payment for the rights, the Government sent a trader named Huntington to pay off the Indians in blankets.

Huntington promptly cut the blankets in four pieces, gave a "blanket" to each family and made off with the remainder of the material.

In discussion with the Army Engineers over use of the Celilo area for the burgeoning plans of river development and dam construction, Chief Thompson was passively exasperating.

Says his biographer, Mrs. McKeown:

"You see, Chief Tommy believed the fish and the river came from his gods, and were never to be discussed in any way other than that he learned from his elders. So he would speak of them only in Wy'am language.

"Well, the engineers usually had no interpreter who could handle the language well and the discussions usually broke down with the engineers representatives exasperated with the chief and the chief usually indifferent to the whole thing."

But the ways of the whites, says Mrs. McKeown, were too devious for Chief Thompson. Agreements with other tribes who claimed a share of the Celilo fishery were produced as evidence of the Indians' willingness to give up their rights there. Claims Mrs. McKeown, the Wy'ams never signed a paper that they believed would deprive them of their fishery. She also notes that Government payments were made to the Nez Perce Indians for the Celilo fishery, despite the fact that the Nez Perce were never known to have fished there.

Finally, his people under Government supervision, and himself an old relic of a by-gone era, Chief Thompson kept his tribal ways only to himself. In 1955, with proper facilities for his care lacking at Celilo, the tribe appealed to Mrs. McKeown for help. She secured lodging for him at Hanby's rest home in Hood River, where he spent the last 3 years of his life.

True to his heritage he requested—and got—a room with two windows facing east so that he could pray to his gods in the morning sky.

Sunday night the old half-blind chief died. He had seen the white man come, had watched a century of white man's progress

in the Columbia Gorge. Sam Hill, the famed railroader, had brought royalty to visit the proud leader of the Wy'ams.

Monday night, they wrapped him in a new blanket, carried him to a Hood River funeral home. From the Warm Springs Indian Reservation came the great cedar casket that has waited for the chief. His wife, Flora Cushman Thompson, his daughter, Ida Winookie, his son and probable heir to the chieftood, Henry Thompson, will take him to his beloved long house today.

Tonight, the ancient Wy'am chant will rumble from the throats of his tribe, float out over the gorge hillside to the silent lake where, preceding Chief Thompson, the Celilo rapids were buried 2 years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. McGEE in the chair]. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

#### ORDER FOR MEETING AT 11 O'CLOCK TOMORROW MORNING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM FOR DEBATE ON LABOR BILL—NOTICE THAT SENATE WILL CONVENE AT 10:30 A.M. ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that we shall have at least an hour and a half of discussion on the Ervin amendment tomorrow before we vote on it. I make the announcement so that Senators may make their plans accordingly. After the Senate meets at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, we shall have the usual morning hour, to be followed by a quorum call. We shall then have at least an hour and a half of discussion on the Ervin amendment and, following a quorum call, we shall proceed to vote on the amendment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed with the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the author of the bill, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the question of procedure during the consideration of the bill and the matter of convenience in connection with arranging the sessions of the Senate.

We plan to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. After the usual morning hour we shall have at least an hour and a half of discussion on the Ervin amendment.

Then we will vote on the Ervin amendment. We may have other votes tomorrow afternoon. We cannot be sure, however.

We hope to be able to meet on Wednesday at 10:30 a.m., and stay in session rather late, perhaps until 7:30 that evening. It may be that we shall be able to dispose of the bill without having night sessions, but we shall not be able to be sure about that until we get further along with the discussion of the bill. At least we plan to remain in session from 10:30 in the morning to 7:30 in the evening, until we can determine what progress we are making. If it is necessary to have longer sessions to dispose of the bill this week, we can announce them later in the week.

#### LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1555) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] to strike out title VI. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the unanimous consent agreement to limit the time of debate on the amendment becomes effective at this time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President—Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1555, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

In preface to my comments I wish to make clear that I harbor bias neither for labor nor management. I refuse alike to be stamped by proponents of punitive legislation or to be lulled into complacency by advocates of the status quo.

The public interest will not best be served by our submitting here to those who would seek to weaken, cripple, or destroy a free trade union movement. Nor will the public welfare be advanced by our catering to those who would wink at labor abuses and thereby permit the vast majority of honest labor to be brought under a cloud of suspicion and the rightful prerogatives of honest management to be endangered or submerged.

We are confronted at this time with the duty of legislating on certain aspects of one of the main institutions of modern America. Like other American institutions, the trade union movement has grown well beyond the assumptions of its early intimate and fraternal organization. Like other organizations in business, industry, and government also, some unions have become large, imper-



sonal, and bureaucratic systems in which the interests of the individual members have oftentimes become lost, and the members themselves have occasionally become apathetic in fulfilling their responsibilities toward union control.

Within the power vacuum that has thus developed, there have arisen—as the investigations of the McClellan committee have so pointedly revealed—men in both labor and management who have exploited the situation to their own selfish and sometimes corrupt interests.

This has resulted in what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the chief sponsor of the bill, has delineated as abuses of power on the part of both labor and management to the detriment of the welfare of employees, employers, and the public.

The purpose of the measure is, therefore, to correct the conditions which have led to such abuses, and further, in the words of Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, to “aid the American trade union movement to maintain free, democratic, and responsible trade unions, cleansed of the crooks and racketeers who have preyed upon some unions and upon segments of some of the unions.”

It is my earnest conviction, Mr. President—and I speak as a cosponsor of the bill and as a member of both the Subcommittee on Labor which conducted the hearings and the parent Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—that S. 1555 represents a forthright and well-considered advance in the directions indicated by the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and by Mr. Meany.

This effort is not designed, as some would have it, to legislate in the broad field of labor-management relations. That task is for another time and another bill. The floor of the Senate is not the most appropriate place to introduce too many amendments which may succeed only in defeating the equally urgent but more limited aims of the pending bill.

In this respect, I wish to refer to comments from a recent statement by Prof. Archibald Cox, of Harvard Law School. Professor Cox, a specialist in the field of labor-management law, was chairman of the group of experts who worked with the committee staff in drafting the original Kennedy-Ives bill, and he is a member of the group currently studying the entire Taft-Hartley Act. He, therefore, speaks with some considerable authority in this field.

In the opinion of Professor Cox—and in the opinions of the majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—the issues of internal union reform and labor-management relations are different issues which should be dealt with separately. To quote Professor Cox:

The two subjects ought to be handled separately \* \* \* for a number of reasons. In the first place, the two subject matters are analytically distinct. Union reform has to do with the relationship between the organization or the officialdom and the members. Labor-management relations, of course, has to do with union organization, how collective bargaining works, and ultimately, with

the balance of power between management and labor. And to mix the two, I submit, simply causes confusion.

Second, the need for internal reforms should not be made the occasion for enacting repressive measures. We cannot protect union members against financial dishonesty or guarantee internal democracy by weakening the bargaining power of the unions. In presenting reform measures, one of the very important things psychologically—one of the important things in terms of the way employees will react to it—is to make plain that legislation directed at reform is not concerned with weakening the union.

I point out in this respect, Mr. President, the inconsistency of those who seek to remove title VI from the bill as being irrelevant, and yet insist on amending S. 1555 to include provisions against organizational picketing and secondary boycotting.

Not only were the provisions of title VI also in the Kennedy-Ives legislation which passed this body last year by a vote of 88 to 1, but none of the provisions in this section of the bill touches upon the basic power relationships of labor and management. In addition, each of the proposals of title VI has been thoroughly deliberated upon and examined in committee hearings and consequently has been narrowed in its meaning and implications.

While many citizens advocate the need for legislation regarding organizational picketing and the use of the secondary boycott, there remains a wide diversity of opinion on these subjects. In addition, legislation on both issues deals with the fundamental balance of power between labor and management and should properly be advanced only after adequate hearings and preparation. The Republic will not be endangered, Mr. President, if the Senate delays passage on these matters until it is more fully informed.

Leaving aside, therefore, the broad issues of labor-management relations, and turning to the problems of internal union reforms, Senate bill 1555 is a realistic and carefully studied legislative proposal.

It is a proper bill because it is directed toward implementing the four remaining legislative recommendations of the first interim report of the McClellan committee: First, to regulate and control union funds; second, to insure union democracy; third, to curb employer uses of middlemen in labor-management disputes; fourth, to eliminate the ambiguity of the no man's land between State and Federal authority. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] noted on the floor of this body last Wednesday, April 15, 45 specific provisions of the bill which would implement the recommendations of the McClellan committee.

Mr. President, at this point I turn aside to say that constantly we hear that the recommendations from within the McClellan committee, the findings of that group, and the work it has done are not reflected in Senate bill 1555. Mr. President, I repeat that 45 specific provisions of Senate bill 1555 would implement the recommendations which have come to us from the McClellan committee.

Furthermore—and I believe this fact needs to be emphasized, in the light of some of the proposals which have been offered and which will be suggested—the pending measure remains true to the traditional Anglo-Saxon and American concept of justice, in that it places criminal sanctions and penalties where they belong—namely, upon the individual wrongdoer among labor and management officials, rather than upon the rank and file of union or labor movement members.

The Senate is no forum in which to traffic with the mystic concept of collective guilt which would penalize the entire union membership for the wrongdoing of one or a few of its officials. To depart from the ancient principle of justice of individual responsibility and individual guilt is to contravene one of the basic assumptions of a democratic philosophy.

Mr. President, on April 7 there was held, in Parkersburg, W. Va., an election for the mayor of that city. There were 25,546 men and women eligible to vote; they were registered as eligible to ballot in that specific election. Of that total, 10,344 actually cast their ballots. In other words, 60 out of every 100 eligible voters in that election failed to use that franchise of freedom, which was not only an opportunity, but also was a responsibility under our system of government. I say to them—because I believe this is perhaps an appropriate place to say it—that we can drift or, in fact, we can dive into a dictatorship in this country. We can lose democracy by default. I believe we forfeit our freedoms when we, as American citizens, fail to exercise the responsibility of the American ballot.

I tell this story for a very definite reason—namely, because today we are faced, perhaps more than ever before, with a desire on the part of some of us to continue the dignity of the individual. On the other hand, we have bigness all about us—bigness in government, bigness in industry, bigness in labor. Bigness is a part of our American life. Yet I wish to see to it that the individual is not lost in the shuffle.

So, Mr. President, I think it important to note that, in preparing this proposed legislation, we have maintained the ancient principle of justice, of individual responsibility and individual guilt; and this is one of the assumptions of our philosophy in which most Americans believe.

This is also a well-considered bill, Mr. President—indeed, one of the most thoroughly considered in which it has been my privilege to participate. As has been observed before, the 1958 version was passed here by a vote of 88 to 1; it was then further improved by redrafting, before being introduced in the present session. And after another series of exhaustive hearings—bringing the total testimony on the measure to more than 2,300 pages—it was further perfected by the Senate Labor Committee with 46 amendments, and was reported by a vote of 13 to 2, in which process it acquired additional cosponsorship of a bipartisan nature from the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the senior

Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Their own supplemental views are worth quoting at this point, for I believe they concisely express the basic achievements of the bill in its improved version:

It establishes as law the principles of democracy in unions; it adapts to their internal administration the standard of honesty and fair play which are basic to our society; and it provides for conditions which should make for integrity in the relations between unions and representatives of management.

The bill is, of course, not entirely satisfactory to everyone, and is perhaps not even perfectly satisfactory to any member of the committee. We believe, however, that it is a wholesome and substantial contribution to the law at this time which is practical and represents material progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I should like to be allowed an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I devoutly hope that our action will not be restricted due to differences; that we shall ask questions, not in terms of whether a particular policy will circumscribe the power of labor, but, rather, whether it is in the best national interests, as well as in labor's legitimate self-interests.

This is only an instance, however, of the need to avoid the general tendency of interpreting public problems in terms of opposite solutions. Our political discourse and, hence, the solutions to political questions are too often restricted by the use of polar or opposite terms—liberal and conservative, radical and reactionary, labor and management, farmer and consumer, socialist and capitalist, and so forth. The list could be extended. And all of us are familiar with the old platitude, "There are two sides to every question."

Such a polarizing of public problems, however, falsifies the realities of our national life. There are, in fact, as many sides to every question as there are parties or interests involved. And the great genius of the democratic process is that it offers a wider variety of solutions than can be encompassed by mere opposites.

Politics in a democracy is the art of the possible—the art of compromise and conciliation. Webster defines "compromise" as "a settlement by arbitration or by consent reached by mutual concessions." This definition offers us a clue as to how all of us can make worthwhile contributions in the arena of public affairs. Labor-management relations, no less than the life of business and commerce, is in large measure a matter of offering mutual concessions, of arriving at a compromise of interests whereby each party gains some needed satisfaction.

Finally, Mr. President, the main provisions of the pending proposal have the endorsement of an overwhelming number of responsible labor leaders throughout the country, most of whom are equally as concerned and anxious as are we to rid the union movement of the influence of racketeers within its ranks. Representative of the views of such leaders is the statement of Mr. George M. Harrison, grand president of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees, who stated in testimony his belief that:

It is entirely possible to have a strong and effective labor-management reform bill which will forcibly attack such corruption and racketeering as have infiltrated the labor movement, without at the same time sacrificing existing union customs, traditions, and constitutional provisions which have long been recognized as honest, ethical, and democratic and completely compatible with the standard of conduct implicit in this legislation.

In closing, Mr. President, I reiterate that S. 1555 is the product of lengthy and judicious deliberations. The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee heard testimony from the leaders of both interested parties—labor and management—and from disinterested experts identified neither with labor nor management. Many proposals were heard and considered by the members of the committee, and the bill in its present form is the product of the combined judgment of the committee on a vote of 13 to 2. It is my hope, therefore, that the Senate will pass S. 1555 substantially in its present form, and not be led into vain and futile efforts to realine the entire balance of power of labor and management at this time.

We owe it to the overwhelming mass of honest men and women of American labor to assist them in achieving the same basic principles in the union movement that we adhere to in the larger national community as a whole. We owe no less to the American public. This, I believe, S. 1555 will help bring about, and for this reason it has my support.

I remember when, in the 1920's in West Virginia, we had armed guards in the mining camps who worked against giving men the opportunity for collective bargaining, and even to achieve the standards of fair practice within unions. I recall that in the coal fields of West Virginia loyal labor was crucified on the cross of long hours and short pay and inadequate health conditions under which men would toil.

Those conditions were apparent to men and women who studied such circumstances in West Virginia. I remember the advances which have been wrought. I remember the programs which have been placed in State and Federal law, which have changed to a very considerable degree—to an almost entire degree—the situations of which I have spoken. I believed it was necessary for labor organizations to be treated fairly, and I believe labor must continue to be given its rightful recognition. In 1959 the Senate has, in its individual and collective membership, the responsibility of correcting, insofar as possible,

the defects within the labor leadership which have arisen.

We can do that, Mr. President, without punitive action, without destroying the strength of individual members within a union, or the union movement itself.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR MOSS BEFORE NATIONAL CIVIL LIBERTIES CLEARING HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself half a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from Montana is recognized for half a minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On April 17, 1959, at a luncheon meeting at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel in Washington, D.C., the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] delivered an address before the National Civil Liberties Clearing House. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Senator from Utah, like the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], indicates that what he wants in the field of civil rights is the attainable, and not the unattainable. I quote from a portion of his speech, as follows:

The question to be decided this year then, is this: In the light of current conditions, what should be our program? Shall we vote for and attempt to pass and be counted in favor of, legislation that we know will not pass? Or shall we attempt a program that will do some things that very much need doing, and that we can, in all probability, get done?

I hope that all of us in the Senate, regardless of our position on the question of civil rights, will read what the distinguished Senator from Utah pointed out, because it is worthwhile.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF UTAH, BEFORE THE 11TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, NATIONAL CIVIL LIBERTIES CLEARING HOUSE, APRIL 17, 1959, HOTEL SHERATON-CARLTON, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I deem it a compliment, I am sure, to be invited to discuss "Congress and Civil Rights" before a group as representative and as well informed as you who are participating in this conference of the National Civil Liberties Clearing House.

Of the attributes which give meaning to the term "American" none are more important than those which allow every citizen the same treatment before the law, and the same opportunities for advancement, culture and recognition, as those allowed any other.

This is the reason that I found it such a thrill to vote for the admission of Hawaii as our 50th State. For Hawaii today—more than any other section of our country—represents this American ideal of a commonwealth built by citizens who may differ in almost every possible way but who are bound together by a common regard for political liberty.



As a newcomer to Congress, and representing a State which, in its modern history, has not had civil rights as a major issue, one fact about "Congress and Civil Rights" seems more significant to me than any other. (I say "modern history" because Utahans once had the problem in its most acute form. The territory was settled by those who were driven from their homes because of religious beliefs, and there was a time, before statehood, when the right of the majority to control elections was circumvented by a Washington-appointed judiciary.)

But that was long ago, and today the most significant fact to me about Congress and civil rights is that the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is the first legislation on this subject to pass the U.S. Senate since Reconstruction.

The House of Representatives has passed numerous measures, of course, on lynching, poll taxes, and other subjects, and the Senate has conducted some historic debates on them. But the sectional makeup of the Senate has always asserted itself to bar legislation that seriously challenged the prerogatives of officials of the several States.

Many felt that this Congress would be different. Perhaps it was optimism generated by the defeat of many members of the so-called Old Guard. Perhaps it was misreading the results; perhaps just wishful thinking—but it was widely believed that the feeling for civil rights legislation was now so strong that the liberals of both parties would challenge the leadership of the Senate on this issue. It was even predicted that that ancient ornament of the Senate—the filibuster—would be cast aside to make way for the new era.

The vote this year on rule 22 quickly dispelled that illusion. Looking at history, it must be apparent that whatever is done by Congress on civil rights depends on what is satisfactory to the Senate. Therefore, my very short and incomplete analysis of the proposals before Congress will be limited to what is before the Senate.

On the basis of the persons or groups sponsoring them, there are four general types of bills: First, the administration bills, one introduced by Senator GOLDWATER, the rest by Senator DIRKSEN, the minority leader; second, the Johnson bills, introduced by the majority leader; third, the Douglas bills, introduced by Senator DOUGLAS, the Democrat who was a leader in the fight on rule 22; and fourth, what I will call the Javits-Keating bills, introduced by the New York Republicans.

As you know, many of these bills contain provisions, or parts of provisions, or ideas, from other bills and groups of bills.

As far as content goes, which I think is the most useful division for our purpose today, let's divide the proposals in two groups, putting in the first group those which seem to have the support of all shades of opinion.

This first group has three main points. The first is the extension of the term, or of the time to report, of the present Civil Rights Commission. Second are various provisions to strengthen the laws against terrorism, intimidation and destruction of property.

One of the Dirksen bills, for example, punishes interstate flight to avoid prosecution for destruction of educational and religious structures. A very similar provision is in one of Senator KEATING's bills. Title IV of Senator JOHNSON's bill makes it a crime to transport or possess explosives for the purpose of intimidation or wrongful destruction, and permits the FBI to investigate, and to cooperate with State authorities, in cases of destruction of buildings by explosives.

The third idea is to strengthen the Attorney General's hand in compelling preservation and disclosure of voting records.

This first group of bills, then, contains three ideas that are rather generally agreed upon, and can most likely be passed. To repeat, they are (1) extending the life of the

Civil Rights Commission; (2) strengthening the laws against terrorism; and (3) preserving and disclosing Federal election records.

The second group of bills includes provisions which have historically failed to pass; which would make the Justice Department, one way or another, responsible for deciding whether local officials are violating the 14th amendment, and would obligate the Attorney General to take action to compel compliance.

Senator DOUGLAS, for example, would authorize the Secretary of HEW to approve, and if necessary, prepare plans to carry out desegregation, and would require the Attorney General to enforce the plans if local official did not.

Senator JAVITS would authorize the Attorney General to institute civil injunctive proceedings against local officials who deprive citizens of their rights under the 14th amendment.

And there are many other proposals in this second group. But they all have one thing in common—they would make it the obligation of the Federal Government to take over if the States, in the opinion of Federal officials, failed to guarantee to citizens their rights.

And this, of course, is the point where the Senate has historically refused to move. It was just this provision—to allow the Attorney General to institute civil suits—that was taken out of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

The question to be decided this year then, is this: In the light of current conditions, what should be our program? Should we vote for and attempt to pass and be counted in favor of, legislation that we know will not pass? Or shall we attempt a program that will do some things that very much need doing, and that we can, in all probability, get done?

Our ultimate purpose always must be to end discrimination as rapidly as possible. And the long history of the civil rights struggle has shown the futility of the belief that education alone can or will accomplish our purpose. Important as education is, it must be bolstered by firm legal action.

Our immediate purpose then should be to develop that program that will move us furthest along the road in the immediate future.

It would be a tragic mistake, in my opinion, to discuss any congressional program for civil rights other than in the light of the great school desegregation program now being carried out. The collapse of massive resistance in Virginia, and the subsequent more realistic efforts of Governor Almond and the legislature to meet the problems of that collapse, signals the beginning of the end of legal segregation, although we must realize that unofficial segregation, through private schools may continue for some time. Surely this is a great victory in our struggle.

And any action Congress takes must—it seems to me—help, not hinder, this desegregation process. The Civil Rights Commission should finish its job, and give to the Congress and the country the benefit of its findings.

Those officials who are fighting terrorism, and those individuals who must face terrorism to stand for their rights, are entitled to the strongest measures we can pass to help them.

Standing up to be counted has value. And the great congressional debates have served to dramatize the denials of civil rights and to arouse America's conscience.

But it may be that this year our attempt should be a unified one to consolidate our gains, to pass those items for which we have the votes, and to lay the groundwork for a further congressional assault on denials of rights through the 14th amendment. To move forward, even though slightly, advances the cause.

Such a period of consolidation must of course be temporary and of short duration.

And it should be fully utilized to advance the cause of civil rights everywhere on a local and State basis. The focus of national attention will be on the South, on the Negro, and on desegregation. But civil rights gains need to be made in every State in the Union and for every minority whose national origin makes it the victim of discrimination.

And every local improvement will be reflected in Congress, and particularly where it is needed most in Congress—the Senate. And every State advance will bring nearer the day when Congress will enact a complete civil rights law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Politics has been defined as the art of the possible. One might, in the light of what has been stated, say it is also the art of the attainable. I think we can proceed as practical persons by subscribing to that thesis.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure we can. Like the distinguished minority leader, I anticipate we will be able to come up with a satisfactory, reasonable civil rights bill at this session.

#### TRIBUTES TO SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield time to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator from Oregon desire?

Mr. NEUBERGER. About 30 seconds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, determined dedication to the service of his country will always be recognized as the outstanding characteristic of John Foster Dulles. This untiring devotion to a lifetime cause undoubtedly was a major factor in his ultimate but difficult decision to retire as Secretary of State. His personality did not nurture a withdrawal from active participation in service to his Government. In John Foster Dulles, our Nation will always have an example of a man whose high sense of duty transcended his personal welfare. This viewpoint is reflected in newspaper editorials which appeared in the State of Oregon, in the Oregonian on April 16, and in the Coos Bay World on April 14. I ask unanimous consent to have these editorial tributes to John Foster Dulles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tributes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, Apr. 14, 1959]

#### LIFETIME OF SERVICE IS SUM

State Secretary John Foster Dulles' resignation from the Cabinet is now a foregone conclusion by those who saw the indomitable but ailing man on his return to Washington for further checkups of his progress in his battle against cancer.

Whether or not Mr. Dulles has decided to resign is a moot point. The decision, an inexorable one, seems to have been made for him.

Thus an astonishing career of work and faith is at an end. It is one of those sad times, even for those who have been frequent critics of Secretary Dulles' actions and motivations.

Whether or not one has agreed with Mr. Dulles' results in his 6½ years as chief Cabinet officer for President Eisenhower, it is impossible to deny the glittering nature of the man's personality, the force with which he has advocated the U.S. case before the rest of the world and—going beyond his tenure as Secretary of State—the whole lifetime of service and good works which he has stored up for the credit side of his own life's final ledger.

The Secretary's faults, which are naturally overlooked at a time like this, probably resulted from the same single-mindedness which drove him onward to the pinnacle of his lifelong ambitions. It is so with all of us; faults and assets are hopelessly intermingled and it is sometimes impossible to tell them apart.

No one can assess a man's career from such a short distance in time. But it is likely that if John Foster Dulles' career is ever satisfactorily summed, the word "service" will be heavily emphasized. (F. W. A.)

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., Apr. 16, 1959]

#### HE STOOD FAST

The enforced retirement of John Foster Dulles from the office of Secretary of State must come as unwelcome news even to his detractors. For in a real sense he was the embodiment of U.S. foreign policy, a man triply armored against assaults from home and abroad by a vast experience, a flinty determination, and the unquestioned confidence of the President of the United States. His loss will be sorely felt in these next few months of negotiation on the German question.

Yet there could be no other decision. Mr. Dulles had failed to respond, as before, to treatment for cancer. He is no longer physically capable of filling a post which, by his interpretation, is one of the most rigorous in the Government.

It is said in Washington that he prevailed on the President to announce his retirement earlier than Mr. Eisenhower had intended, because Mr. Dulles was well aware that an unsympathetic interpretation might be put on his seeming to hold to his high post although incapacitated. His extreme devotion to and immersion in his work, which could have led to such a conception, have been both strength and weakness. He gave himself, body and mind, to the chief stewardship of U.S. foreign affairs. He gave the appearance of carrying his office with him and of remaining remote from his staff of experts in Washington, D.C., and the other capitals of the world.

His single-purposed intensity sometimes led to unhappy consequences. He was not, in his approach to his job, a profound man. He was a doer, with the creed that it was better to do or say anything at all than to do or say nothing.

Naturally, this led to much criticism, from Americans and from our allies—a good part of it merited. His phrase "massive retaliation" did not stand up under analysis. Nor did his published reference to risking war at the brink. But, on balance, the Dulles works are remarkably impressive. One thing rides above all: He stood fast. He did not bend to the political winds at home or rebukes from abroad. He was a persistent, positive force in a job where those qualities have often been lacking.

It is too early, of course, to say whether the Dulles steel has solved any of our major problems. But it is something to say that he took his stand and held it—and the failure to do just that has been in his lifetime the West's greatest failure in world affairs.

Whatever the eventual settlement on Quemoy, the United States stood firm and thereby (by the testimony here last week of Rear Adm. Samuel Elliot Morison) has won new respect throughout Asia. Whatever future events may be in the Middle East, in Germany or elsewhere over the globe, Mr. Dulles can be proud of the decisive role he played in these areas.

Now there will be a new Secretary of State—and the sooner the better. Whoever he may be, he will have at least one advantage in a very difficult situation: He will have the vigorous and living example of a truly dedicated predecessor.

#### LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1555) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. ERVIN rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina seek recognition? Does the Senator from Montana yield time to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without his losing the floor or any time being taken out of the time allocated?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I send to the desk three amendments to the pending bill, S. 1555, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, before I address myself to the pending amendment, I send forward two amendments to other portions of the bill and ask that they be printed at this point in the Record, and also that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The first amendment submitted by Mr. ERVIN was to delete section 112.

The second amendment was to amend section 601 by adding at the end thereof an additional subsection (C) reading as follows:

Neither this section nor any other provision of this act or the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 shall operate to deprive any employee, employer, labor organization, or other person of any right or remedy under any State law in any case not covered by the provisions of this act or the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as one who has had the privilege of serving on the so-called Senate Rackets Committee for more than 2 years, I feel that there is a crying need for immediate remedial legislation in the field of the relation between unions and union officers on the one hand, and rank-and-file union members on the other.

In common with other members of the Senate Rackets Committee, other Members of Congress, and the public generally, I have been astounded by the virtually unbelievable conditions which the investigations of this committee have revealed with respect to certain unions. I believe that such conditions are exceptional, but I am also convinced from the 17,000 or 18,000 pages of testimony taken before the Senate Rackets Committee that the conditions are sufficiently widespread as to demand the enactment by the Congress of legislation which will put an end to malpractices in the internal affairs of labor unions.

I was much impressed by the wisdom of the statement made by Prof. Archibald Cox, of the Harvard Law School, a specialist in the field of labor law, when the Kennedy-Ives bill was in process of formation during the previous session of Congress. Professor Cox pointed out:

The central problems of labor policy today concern the relationship between union officials and rank-and-file members. They cover five areas: (1) The handling of union finances; (2) conflicts of interest; i.e., the use of union office for personal profit; (3) the use of international trusteeships to take over the affairs of a local union; (4) union elections; and (5) protection of the worker's interest in union membership. In my opinion, the committee would do well to concentrate on these five areas without opening up a host of controversial amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

That was the statement of Professor Cox before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when that committee was in process of drafting the Kennedy-Ives bill.

My amendment, which is now pending before the Senate, is designed to do exactly what Professor Cox said the Congress should do in this field. I maintain that the wisest course of action which could possibly be followed by the Congress in connection with the pending legislation would be, first, to adopt my amendment to strike from the bill title VI; second, thereafter to refuse to write into the bill any amendments dealing with the area covered by the Taft-Hartley Act.

As the able and distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] stated a moment ago, two fields are involved. One is the field of labor reform, which is concerned with malpractices in



the field of internal affairs of unions. That field is adequately dealt with in the first five titles of Senate bill 1555.

The other field, which is now covered by the Taft-Hartley Act, is the field of the external relations of industry on the one hand and the unions on the other. The two fields are distinct from each other. They demand different legislative treatment; and in my judgment it would be unwise to attempt to combine in a single bill provisions dealing with both these fields.

I was very much interested in the Kennedy-Ives bill at the previous session of Congress. I made the point then which I am trying to make now, that we should remove from the bill all provisions dealing with nongermane amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, and leave them for later consideration in a separate bill.

The investigations conducted by the McClellan committee show the absolute need for legislation to protect a group of American citizens who now have no protection whatever. I refer to the rank-and-file union members who have the misfortune to hold membership in unions which are controlled by dictatorial union officers, in some instances, and by corrupt union officers in other instances. They have no protection under Federal law, and in many cases they have no protection under State law, because local officials in some places do not seem to be concerned about the wrongs inflicted upon these unfortunate union members.

The investigations of the McClellan committee also show the need for some legislation in the field now covered by the Taft-Hartley Act. I favor legislation in the instances disclosed by the investigations of the McClellan committee, where it appears that there is a need for legislation in the field of the Taft-Hartley Act.

We have found that some unions have virtually ceased making bona fide efforts to persuade those who labor to join them. Instead of seeking by persuasion to induce workers to believe that their interests lie in joining them, these particular unions throw picket lines around plants and, in many cases, even hire persons who are not union members to walk in the picket lines. Their object is to force the managements of the plants being picketed to coerce their employees to join such unions, regardless of the wishes of such employees. According to my way of thinking, that is an interference with and a denial of the basic rights of those who work in the plants which are picketed. The investigations of the McClellan committee show a crying need for regulation of this organizational picketing.

The investigations also show that in some instances the secondary boycott device has been abused with the result of absolutely wrecking and destroying the business of innocent persons who were not parties to the labor dispute and had no connection whatever with it. They have had their businesses destroyed, not because the unions had any complaint against them, but only because the unions wanted to practice indirect economic coercion upon certain other employers.

Therefore, I say there is need for a clarification of the law affecting secondary boycotts; indeed, there is a crying need for such legislation. It is almost as great as the crying need for legislation in the field of labor reform.

There is a difference, however, which prompts me to put the case of labor reform ahead of necessary changes in the field of the Taft-Hartley Act. The difference is that under the Taft-Hartley Act as it now exists unions have substantial protection against abuses on the part of management, and management has substantial protection against abuses on the part of unions. But rank-and-file-union members, who have the misfortune to belong to unions controlled by officers who are dictatorial or corrupt, have no protection whatever.

When the Kennedy-Ives bill was pending before the Senate last year, I made this statement:

I should like to confine the bill to the first five titles, which provide remedies to prevent abuses toward the rank and file of labor members in their democratic rights as members of local unions, those abuses which result in the misuse of union funds, and those abuses illustrated by the sweetheart contracts between union leaders and management. Therefore, I would vote for an amendment to strike out title 6 entirely and to restrict the bill solely to those matters investigated by the McClellan committee. That action would result in a bill for which every man who believes in honesty and square dealing . . . could vote without misgivings.

I am satisfied that if the course which I then advocated had been pursued, we would have had on the statute books of the Nation for many months now gone the salient features of the first five titles of the Kennedy-Ives bill, which are in large part similar to the first five titles of Senate bill 1555.

When the Kennedy-Ives bill was before the Senate at the last session, I made this statement:

I used to read Aesop's Fables. In Aesop's Fables there is a story about a dog which started across a foot log with a bone in its mouth. The dog saw his reflection and the reflection of the bone he was carrying in the creek. Being anxious to get the bone he thought he saw in the creek, he opened his mouth to grab that bone, and lost the bone he had. That is precisely what is going to happen with respect to this bill if we load the bill down with a lot of amendments which are not germane to the restricted field covered by the first five titles.

Mr. President, I believe that we are in danger of doing exactly the same thing in respect to the pending bill by retaining in the bill title VI and section 112 of title I which undertakes to change the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act relating to the anti-Communist oath.

When the Kennedy-Ives bill was before the Senate last year I also said:

Mr. President, the lot of a legislator is not always a happy one. Many times he is compelled to vote against proposed legislation which he favors. Insofar as I am concerned, that is true in respect to the amendment submitted by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida. I am strongly in favor of the enactment of a law which will carry out the objective of his amendment. But . . . Mr. President, if the bill . . . is used by us as a vehicle for a consideration of all the changes which Senators think

should be made in the Taft-Hartley Act, we would make it certain, insofar as this session of Congress is concerned, that the labors of the McClellan select committee have been in vain. Undoubtedly there are many areas in which the Taft-Hartley Act should be amended; and it should be amended in the area to which the amendment of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida applies. . . . It is better to do one job at a time. It is much better for the Senate to pass a law which the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress . . . will support, than it is to propose to that law amendments which will make it virtually certain that no legislation in this field will be enacted at this session.

On another occasion when amendments designed to eliminate the so-called no man's land in the field of labor law were being discussed, I again pleaded with the Senate in this way:

Let us do one job at a time.

Again, on another occasion when the Senate was considering amendments relating to secondary boycotts, I said:

I wish to reiterate that if we use the pending bill as a vehicle for either weakening or strengthening the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, we shall insure that there will be no labor legislation in this session of Congress.

We are likewise confronted at this time by two alternatives. The first is to strip from the bill amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act not germane to the primary object of the bill, which is to prevent improper practices in the internal affairs of unions. That is one alternative. If we should take that course, which is the object of the pending amendment, then the Senate would pass the bill with a minimum of debate and delay, and in all probability the House would do the same. We could then turn our attention in an adequate fashion to the consideration of the whole Taft-Hartley law.

But if we allow any nongermane Taft-Hartley provisions to remain in the bill we invite every Senator who has any idea of how the Taft-Hartley Act should be amended to offer his amendments. Indeed, we invite all the people of America, all the business interests of the country, and everybody else concerned, to insist on the inclusion of Taft-Hartley amendments in the bill.

If we leave the bill open for the re-writing of the Taft-Hartley Act on the floor of the Senate we are likely to end either with no legislation whatever to protect the rank-and-file members of certain unions who have had their rights so much abused by the men who were supposed to look after their interests, or we will mangle the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes to engage in a discussion with the Senator from North Carolina.

First, I appreciate the position which the Senator has taken. He is a cosponsor of the bill and has been a member of the McClellan committee since its inception. He is vitally interested in the reform sections of the so-called Kennedy-Ervin bill. I know that his interest in seeking to strike out title VI is based only on the fact that he feels its presence in the bill imperils the bill's passage by both the Senate and the House and its signature by the President.

My reasons for opposing the amendment are somewhat similar to the reasons for which the Senator from North Carolina proposes the amendment. I stated about a month ago that I would join with the Senator from North Carolina in seeking to strike out title VI if I believed that its presence in the bill imperiled the chances for the passage of the bill. As of today—my view may change as the debate proceeds—I do not think its presence imperils the passage of the bill. In fact, I have some reason to believe that its presence will help the bill to sail through both the Senate and the House and toward signature by the President.

In title VI there are six amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. The first is the no man's land amendment, one of the five original recommendations of the McClellan committee. I think it was first included at the instance of former Senator Ives, who was quite concerned about the problem. It was one of the five basic recommendations of the committee in its first annual report. So this part of title VI is quite germane. Even though we may not have arrived at a happy solution to the problem, nevertheless the problem deserves consideration in the bill because of the position which the McClellan committee took.

As to the problem of construction trades, the Senator from North Carolina is aware of the fact that when a labor bill was introduced in March of last year, it contained no section dealing with any amendments to the Taft-Hartley law; the bill was confined to the recommendations of the McClellan committee.

When the debate on the pension and welfare bill took place in the Senate in April, two amendments were offered to that bill. One, which was offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], contained a provision dealing with economic strikers, which is now in title VI. The other amendment dealt with the building trades. It was offered by former Senator Smith of New Jersey, who was the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

When an arrangement was made whereby in return for defeating those amendments as a part of the pension and welfare bill, we would commit ourselves to reporting a bill to the Senate by June 15, Senator Smith of New Jersey rose to ask if we would consider as a part of the agreement the administration's recommendations regarding the Taft-Hartley amendments. In order to prevent the pension bill from being loaded down with completely ungermane amendments, I made a commitment that we would consider those amendments as well as the actual reform provisions.

So the genesis of those provisions is in the administration's recommendations and in the commitment I made on the floor of the Senate to former Senator Smith of New Jersey.

We did consider those recommendations along with the reform measures. They were acted on favorably by the committee and were reported to the Senate. They were submitted to yea and nay votes, and all of them were agreed to by the Senate, in some cases by a unani-

mous vote, and in other cases by a vote of two to one.

Again this year, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, when he came before our committee, recommended all of these provisions. Although they may be somewhat different in language, they are a part of the administration's program. Most of them have been endorsed by the Senate by a rather large vote, and by a rather large vote in the committee. If accepted, I believe they will help the passage of the bill in the House of Representatives.

For that reason, while what the Senator from North Carolina has said is quite effective and deserves careful consideration, yet in my judgment, the provisions of title VI will help the bill toward its ultimate passage, rather than hinder it. That is the reason why we were going ahead with what I know the Senator from North Carolina quite responsibly feels is a somewhat dangerous course. But that is the reason for the course. That is the reason why, as of today, I feel we should proceed with these amendments to the Taft-Hartley law in the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. Title VI contains six amendments which deal with the Taft-Hartley Act. Only two of them were adopted by the Senate at its last session as parts of the Kennedy-Ives bill; namely, section 602, which is in the same form in which it passed the Senate in the Kennedy-Ives bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. It was agreed to by a vote of 60 to 29.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. It is in the same condition in which it appeared in Senate bill 505 as originally introduced.

The other provision which passed the Senate in the Kennedy-Ives bill, and which was in Senate bill 505 when it was originally introduced, is found in section 603. That is the section which makes so-called economic strikers eligible to vote in representation elections held during a labor controversy.

Section 605 in the pending bill, which is the so-called quickie election provision, has never passed the Senate, a somewhat similar quickie election provision in the Kennedy-Ives bill was actually struck out by the Senate. This particular section 605 was not adopted by the Senate last year, and was not in Senate bill 505 when it was introduced.

Another section which has been added by the committee is section 606. This, in my judgment, is the only noncontroversial proposal for the amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act. That section merely provides that the President may appoint an acting general counsel when there is no regular general counsel.

Another amendment which was added by the committee is section 604, which provides that the term "supervisor" shall not be construed to include service assistants in the communication industry.

I think that amendment and the one relating to the no man's land in the field of labor law, as reported by the committee, should be eliminated—I started to say on their merits—but I will say, instead, on their demerits.

When the no man's land provision was adopted by the Senate last year, and when it was incorporated in the original

bill this year, it was very simple and direct. It provided that the National Labor Relations Board should take jurisdiction of all controversies arising under the Taft-Hartley Act.

It contained a provision, however, to the effect that wherever a State had established an agency, under State law, which conformed to the Taft-Hartley Act, the National Labor Relations Board could cede to such State agency the enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act in instances, when the impact of the alleged controversy on interstate commerce was not substantial.

Before I discuss the no man's land provision in the pending bill, I wish to commend the committee for its hard work. In particular, I wish to commend the very able and distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I have never known a Member of the Senate to work harder on any matter than the junior Senator from Massachusetts has worked on this, not only during the present session, but also during the last session.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. And I wish to commend him for his study, his courage, and the high degree of intelligence he has brought to this task.

I wish to say that I think the provisions of the first 5 titles are as fine as can be devised to deal with malpractices in the internal affairs of unions; and I like the approach of these titles better than that of other measures, because, as the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] said a few moments ago, these titles go along with the Anglo-Saxon principle of justice, in that they visit the consequences of their sins upon the sinners, rather than upon the innocent.

But I think the no man's land provision as reported by the committee should be stricken out on its demerits; and the same statement applies to the provision about supervisors in the communications industry.

The Taft-Hartley Act has always proceeded on the theory that it is a general law, and that whether a particular person is to be regarded as a supervisor is to be determined by the uniform definition contained in the law applying to all industries.

But section 604 contains the provision that the term "supervisor"—

shall not be construed to include service assistants in the communications industry.

No definition of "service assistants" is to be found in the act. Apparently that is a title which is assigned to certain persons by the communications industry; and if that industry were to change the title of such persons, we might wind up by finding that for all practical purposes the telephone industry or some other communications industry had amended an act of Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.



Mr. KENNEDY. On the point of whether these amendments should be included in the bill, let me say that I am not sure that I agree with the Senator's count of what was done last year and what was done this year.

The no-man's-land amendment is now in somewhat different form than its form of last year, when it was approved by the Senate when it passed the McClellan bill.

The construction-trades amendment is the same as the amendment which was adopted by the Senate last year by a vote of 60 to 29.

In regard to the economic strikers' provision, we have included language identical to that suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], which was adopted unanimously by the Senate on a voice vote.

In the case of the supervisors, the Senator from North Carolina will remember that the language the bill contained last year—and I was never completely happy about it—was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 47 to 38.

In order to perfect the legislative provisions in regard to the definition of supervisors, we confined this language to a small segment of the communications industry. Ninety-five percent of the service assistants are now in a union organization; but there has been some feeling that the Board should change the previous interpretations, which have caused considerable difficulty within the communications industry.

Those we are discussing are the ones at the telephone company to whom we talk when we cannot get a particular telephone number. Then we ask for the supervisor; and the supervisor then comes to the telephone. She is a telephone operator; she is not a supervisor in the sense of being one who has to do with the disciplining of employees. In short, she is not a supervisor in the traditional sense.

I repeat that 95 percent of the supervisors are now in a union organization. We are not attempting to disturb the existing pattern.

This amendment is greatly improved over the corresponding provision of last year's bill; and I think this amendment is not greatly controversial, although some may disagree.

In the case of the prehearing elections amendment, let me state that the sponsor is the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. He will remember that in his very fine remarks in regard to the Coffee case, he criticized the Board for not having taken quick enough action—with the result that Mr. Coffee was put out of business. As a result of that statement by the Senator from North Carolina, which I thought was effective, and also as a result of a recommendation by Mr. Leedom, of the Board, it was felt that there should be swifter procedure in such elections, rather than have either the union or management draw out the case so long so that either one would be ruined financially.

The prehearing election amendment, which I believe is quite adequately safeguarded now, and is better than the administration language we had at first,

was recommended by the administration to deal with cases similar to the Coffee case, which was considered by the McClellan committee; and I think the amendment will accomplish a good deal to speed up the procedures of the Board. I think this amendment comes under the general purposes for which the McClellan committee was established.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I deny that this section harmonizes with what I said in that case. Instead, it is exactly the opposite. In that case the validity of the election was challenged after the election was held.

As a matter of fact, this provision of the pending bill will permit the very thing that happened in the Coffee case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from North Carolina has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, this provision of the bill would allow the election to be held first, and thereafter the validity of the election could be considered and determined. I think that is what occurred in the Coffee case, in which an election was held, but the votes were not allowed to be counted for several months.

Under this provision of the pending bill, the election would be held and then there would be a decision as to whether the election should have been held in the first place. I believe it would be better to decide that question in advance.

Mr. KENNEDY. In connection with this point, let me quote from a statement by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] himself:

But it seems to me as if Congress is going to have to step in and pass some kind of a law to give a man a right of action, where any party takes and maliciously abuses the adjudicatory processes under the National Labor Relations Board.

We are attempting to get at the following: If a union is the bargaining union for a thousand persons, and if there is a question as to whether 50 of them should be permitted to vote in an election, it is possible for the employer or the union to drag out the case for month after month, while the Board considers whether those persons should be permitted to vote.

We propose that, after due notice to both parties, the election be held. It might be that the union would win the election by 850 votes to 50 votes; so it would make no particular difference whether the 50 in question were held to be in the bargaining union.

That is why we believe this provision will speed up the procedures of the National Labor Relations Board, but will not lessen the legitimate rights of either the union or the management.

Mr. ERVIN. This language is an improvement over that contained in the Kennedy-Ives bill, in that this language does include some safeguards which were not included in the similar provision of the Kennedy-Ives bill.

On the other hand, this provision will permit a repetition of what happened in the Coffee case, where an election was held in January, but it took until April to decide whether the election was valid although only a half dozen votes were involved. Matters of this nature ought to be determined before an election is held.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should be glad to yield myself time from the time available—

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona whatever time he may require.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, I think the colloquy we have just heard points up very adequately why the amendment of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina should receive adequate and favorable consideration.

At the outset, I wish to point out that I have said, right along, that we should deal only with Taft-Hartley Act amendments which would apply to discrepancies and wrongdoings which have been disclosed by the McClellan committee.

At one time or another I suggested to various Members on the Democratic side of the aisle that we specifically confine the Taft-Hartley Act amendments to those areas.

I cannot quite agree with my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], when he says these amendments are not controversial. In many respects these are the same amendments which were so controversial last year, and which I think was the reason why the bill was not passed last year by the House of Representatives.

I should like to see the Taft-Hartley amendments include the field of secondary boycotts and picketing, and I am hopeful amendments to that effect will prevail.

I have said that without such amendments this cannot be meaningful legislation. The subject which was just discussed, namely, supervisors, is a good example of what my concern is. By no stretch of the imagination has the McClellan committee disclosed any need for changing the description of supervisor. In fact, if the Senator will read the hearings of last year, he will find very little testimony on that subject was taken. As I recall, it was confined to 200 words on the National Labor Relations Board side, and about 1,200 words on the side of one of the members of the committee.

If the supervisor clause remains in the bill, even if modified—and I may say it has been modified to a very marked degree—there is a question in my mind as to what effect there will be on the small telephone companies, which may not employ a person designated as a supervisor, but such an employee in a small telephone company may become subject to our labor laws whereas he is not now subject to them.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator think my point valid on that question? It is this: If we are going to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to it should provide definitions which will apply, generally, instead of relating to a particular position in a particular industry. The industry in question may change the title of that position.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator, but my fear is that if now, for the first time, we pick out a specific industry and change the definition of the duties of a member of that industry to entitle him to the benefits under this act, it is not beyond reason to assume that next year we may be asked to make a change here, there, and every other place in the field, and we may wind up with such a condition that the only individuals in a company who will not be covered by the act will be the president and the vice president. The labor organization might slowly take over the prerogatives of management, which I am convinced no thinking labor leader wants to have happen. My basic fear is not so much over what we are asked to do in this instance; it is what we might be doing by way of precedent that concerns me. As I have said many times before, in this body and other places, I feel the secondary boycott ban and the ban on blackmail picketing should be a part of the Taft-Hartley amendments. It is difficult for me to understand why the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee would leave these two items out when they are applicable to the situations disclosed by the McClellan committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is because I think the subjects are so extremely complicated and so extremely controversial that, if added to this bill, the odds would be against the bill's ever reaching the President's desk. That is why I am opposed to such an amendment. In the amendments the Senator has drawn dealing with picketing and boycott, he has not included amendments identical with what the administration amendments proposed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree.

Mr. KENNEDY. When a member of the committee offers amendments on the floor which are not the same as the ones he offered some time ago, it indicates how difficult it is to write such amendments.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is aware of the fact that after the majority had agreed on a no man's land procedure, at the next meeting the Members disagreed. I do not say this subject is noncontroversial. I say all amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, in both the administration's proposal and the Kennedy bill, are controversial. If we are to have a controversy, why not go ahead and have a little more extended controversy, and include the two fields which I feel must be covered if we are to enact effective legislation?

I am not afraid of any argument which may come up on the floor of the Senate about secondary boycotting and picketing. If we could have some kind

of unanimous-consent agreement that there would be no other field explored in the Taft-Hartley law, I would be perfectly willing to join in such an agreement; but I do not feel we can pass meaningful legislation without covering those two fields.

Mr. KENNEDY. In other words, if title VI had been stricken out, the Senator from Arizona would agree to putting aside boycotting and picketing amendments.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If we had agreed to strike title VI, I would be agreeable to limiting the field only to boycotts and picketing.

Mr. KENNEDY. If we could have stricken out title VI, the Senator would have agreed to what?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That if we could have had a general agreement or a unanimous-consent agreement that title VI would be stricken, I would be willing to agree that the only fields in the Taft-Hartley law to be covered would be boycott and picketing.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not see how the Senator from Arizona can be a successful businessman. That is one of the worst deals I have ever heard of. When I say something is noncontroversial, I always exempt the Senator from Arizona. What I mean is that the Republican leadership on the other side of the aisle is in agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has no time to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I said I was in a rather embarrassing position of borrowing time from the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Massachusetts willing to yield 5 minutes each to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I was hoping the Senator from Massachusetts would agree to a unanimous-consent agreement whereby we could get to the fields of secondary boycott and picketing, and, with that exception, forget all about title VI. I assure him the question would be much less controversial than he thinks it would be.

I do not want to take any more time of my friend from North Carolina. I will speak to this subject later, if I can find time to do so. Possibly my friend from Massachusetts will yield me time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; I shall be glad to yield the Senator time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not want to elaborate on the subject now.

In closing my discussion, I feel that if we act in the field of the Taft-Hartley law and do not include secondary boycott and picketing, we are really undercutting the so-called blue ribbon committee which the Senator from Massachusetts and I selected, and which is busily engaged in drawing up their recommendations in the Taft-Hartley field. We are taking up recommenda-

tions in the Taft-Hartley field which have not been based on any disclosure at all by the McClellan hearings, and we are leaving out legislation in the field of secondary boycott and picketing, without which I do not think we can in truth say to the American people, "Here is a labor reform bill."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have a proposition I will make to every Member of the Senate. If the Senate will adopt my amendment and thus strike out the nongermane Taft-Hartley amendments, as it ought to do, I will enter into a gentleman's agreement to join Senators in voting down every other nongermane Taft-Hartley amendment to the pending bill, including the ones I think ought to be made law. I am willing to do that and take a chance on their being embodied in a later bill. That procedure would afford me great relief, because it would result in giving protection to the members of unions now controlled by dictatorial or corrupt officers—men who now have no protection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who has done such a fine job as head of the McClellan committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator, who is also on the committee, and whose services on that committee have contributed greatly to the disclosures which have been made by the committee.

Mr. President, I wish to endorse what I understood the distinguished Senator to say with reference to the Taft-Hartley Act amendments. At the time I introduced S. 1137, I stated on the floor of the Senate that it did not deal with any Taft-Hartley amendments or revision.

I said at that time, Mr. President, that since the revision of the Taft-Hartley Act was highly controversial and since no one could maintain that some reform legislation was not needed in connection with corruption, the internal operation of unions, and their administration, I felt we should concentrate on that matter and get as good a bill as we could get to deal with that matter alone, later bringing in at the present session of Congress a separate bill which would provide a vehicle for offering amendments any Senator might have in mind to revise the Taft-Hartley Act.

I endorse what the able Senator from North Carolina has said. I should be happy to join with him in that regard, but I point out that there are only two real Taft-Hartley Act amendments which I think anyone would argue about in connection with the bill under consideration. One of them is not in title VI. One of them is subsection (3) on page 25, dealing with the shakedown picketing.

My understanding is that the Hobbs Act already covers that matter with a much heavier penalty than would be provided by the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The time of the Senator from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.



Mr. McCLELLAN. The Justice Department is greatly concerned about what we are proposing to do to the Hobbs Act, which provides a penalty for extortion up to as high as 20 years imprisonment, whereas the bill under consideration would reduce the penalty, as I recall, to 1 year. That is a serious matter.

An attempt, which really amounts to nothing, is made to deal with the no man's land problem in title VI. If Senators agreed to eliminate title VI, I would agree not to offer to the bill under consideration any amendments for the revision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I maintain the duty would then devolve upon the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to report a bill dealing with the revision of the Taft-Hartley Act in the present session of Congress. Then we could fight out these controversial matters. I would not wish to jeopardize the enactment in some form or another, of the bill presently under consideration, for I believe we all agree the bill should be passed and passed immediately.

Mr. ERVIN. I rejoice in the fact that the position of the Senator from Arkansas with regard to the wise course to pursue under present circumstances conforms to my views. As I understand it, the Senator agrees with me that if we strike out all nongermane Taft-Hartley Act amendments and other amendments not germane to the primary objective of this particular bill, and refuse to consider any more such amendments, we can get speedy passage of the bill to cover this field, but that we are likely not to get any legislation passed if we try to mix all these things up together.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is some danger—I do not know how great it is, and no one can foretell—that we may finally get no legislation, as happened last year.

With the convictions I have, I certainly cannot remain silent on this floor and let title VI and the other provision to which I have referred stay in the bill without offering amendments which I think are important in the field of revision of the Taft-Hartley Act. If one amendment goes in, others are bound to be offered.

Mr. ERVIN. That is the point I have been trying to make. So long as any nongermane amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act remain in the bill, there is an invitation to every Member of the Senate to offer such amendments as he thinks ought to be made to the Taft-Hartley Act, and each Senator is perfectly justified in taking that position, because he might well come to the conclusion that this will be the only opportunity he will have to accomplish that end.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. ERVIN. How much time have I used, Mr. President; or, how much of my time has been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has 132 minutes remaining. The Senator has used 48 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield some time to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. That will be sufficient. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina a question with regard to the threats which are reported to have been made by certain prominent labor leaders, who were quoted as saying, in effect, that in the event title VI were stricken from the bill they would work actively against passage of the bill as a whole. Does the distinguished Senator think that is a matter to which we should give some thought?

Mr. ERVIN. I can answer only for myself. I do not succumb to threats.

I cannot really think that the leaders of organized labor are so short of statesmanship as to oppose the passage of this bill merely because they cannot get some amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act written into it. Surely they will not oppose a bill which prohibits taking unrepentant convicted felons out of penitentiaries and placing them in positions of authority over honest union men, as was done in a number of instances, as shown by the McClellan committee investigation.

I cannot really believe the leaders of organized labor will take the position that we should pass no legislation to prevent corrupt union leaders from plundering the treasuries of unions.

I cannot really believe that labor leaders would oppose passage of legislation which would give the rank-and-file members of unions a voice in their own affairs in unions in which they have been long denied such voice. The investigations of the select committee revealed one union in which over 50 percent of the dues-paying members did not have a right to vote, under the union's constitution. I cannot really believe any responsible American labor leader would adopt such a shortsighted policy.

Mr. PROUTY. I certainly hope the Senator is correct in that assumption.

Mr. ERVIN. After all, so far as I am concerned, I am going to try to have enacted legislation which will serve what I conceive to be the best interests of the American people. By reason of my service on the Senate Rackets Committee, I am convinced the first five titles of the pending bill, with the exception of the amendments which do not relate to the field of internal affairs of unions, ought to be made law just as speedily as possible. Certainly that is an event which will happen if we strike out all nongermane amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, and refuse to allow any more to be written into the bill under consideration.

Mr. PROUTY. Assuming that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina is agreed to, can either the Senator from North Carolina or the

junior Senator from Massachusetts, with some degree of assurance, make any statement as to when action will be taken on a bill to amend the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. ERVIN. I regret very much that I cannot answer the question of the able and distinguished Senator from Vermont. I am not a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. PROUTY. I am a member of the committee, and I have no idea when such an action would be forthcoming. I believe the commission which was appointed is supposed to report sometime around the first of June. Obviously, since the proposed legislation would be very controversial, it would be considered at great length by the subcommittee and by the full committee. I think we can definitely say no legislation of that character will be enacted at the present session of Congress, and perhaps not next year.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I desire to speak to that point very briefly. We have two alternatives if we retain nongermane Taft-Hartley amendments in the bill. One is to enact no legislation. The other is to mangle the Taft-Hartley Act.

In my native county of Burke many years ago there was a bricklayer named John Watts. He took a notion that he was called to preach. His skill as a bricklayer was considerable, but his knowledge of theology was otherwise.

One of his neighbors who was named Job Hicks happened to go by the little country church where John was preaching one Sunday afternoon. Job Hicks had had several drinks of Burke County corn, which is alleged to be a very potent beverage. As Job staggered by the church, he saw John up in the pulpit attempting to expound the scriptures. Job staggered up the aisle, grabbed John by the coat collar, dragged him to the door of the church, and threw him out.

Job was subsequently tried and convicted for disturbing a religious meeting. He was convicted by a jury. When Judge Robinson, the presiding judge, called Job up for sentence, he said, with a very stern countenance, "Now, Job, when you were guilty of this violent conduct on a Sabbath day, you must have been so drunk as not to realize what you were doing." Job Hicks replied, "Your Honor, it is true I had had several drinks. But I would not want Your Honor to think I was so drunk that I could stand by and see the word of the Lord 'mummicked up' like that without doing something about it."

If we try to rewrite the Taft-Hartley law on the floor of the Senate, the Taft-Hartley law will be "mummicked up." It would be "mummicked up" by the so-called no man's land provision reported by the committee. Under this provision the National Labor Relations Board would delegate to an agency created by a State the power to enforce Federal law, if the State agency were authorized by the State law to accept the delegated power. The State agency would then become an agent of the Federal Government instead of an agent of the State for the purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes. Under this provision, any orders which the State agency issues could be enforced only by the National Labor Relations Board, and could be enforced only in the Federal courts. There is not a State agency in the United States which would have the power, under State law, to enter into any such agreement with the National Labor Relations Board. There is not a State that would be willing to have its State agencies robbed of the power, under State law, to resort to State courts.

Then there is the provision that the State agency which is established by the State to give protection to its citizens may not even seek temporary preventive relief without the consent of the National Labor Relations Board. This would mean "mummicking up" the no-man's-land provision, which was originally in the bill. I do not believe that there is a State in the country which has a statute on its books authorizing any State agency to convert itself into such a helpless tribunal.

This proposal proves what I have been saying, namely, that if we attempt to write Taft-Hartley amendments into this bill while we are primarily concerned with malpractice in the internal affairs of unions, we are in danger of obtaining no legislation on the one hand or mangling Taft-Hartley Act on the other.

So the question before us is simply this: Shall we strike out the nongermane Taft-Hartley amendments and pass a bill to give protection to persons who now have no protection under existing law or at the hands of existing enforcement agencies?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I agree completely with the Senator with respect to his comments on the so-called no-man's-land provision in the present bill. I think it is meaningless, impracticable, and impossible of administration. But I believe that there is an approach which would relieve the situation to some extent. I have several amendments directed to that end. I think they give proper consideration to the question, and if they are properly explained and understood, we can remedy that situation to some degree now. I think it is vitally important to the small businessman and the small union that they have relief in this field, which relief is not available to them under present law.

Mr. ERVIN. What the Senator says emphasizes the point I have been trying to make. It is a disgrace to our country when people suffer wrongs, and are denied any remedy for such wrongs. We should make a conscientious effort to correct the situation which exists in this field. I think it can best be done by considering those questions in a separate bill, rather than in a bill which deals primarily with other things.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe I stated a moment ago—but I will restate it for the Record if I did—that if title VI remains in the bill, and if the section relating to shakedown picketing, as it is commonly known, remains in the bill, I propose to offer four amendments, all in the nature of bills which I have previously introduced, and which are now before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

One amendment would deal with picketing, so as to make recognition and organizational picketing unlawful. Therein lies the great power of the Teamsters, the Hoffas, and their element. They can place a picket line around a small business and cut off its supplies. The small businessman must either join a union or go out of business.

I propose to offer an amendment regarding the so-called no man's land which will have meaning, and which will require the National Labor Relations Board to say what it will take jurisdiction of, and what it will not take jurisdiction of. It would place the jurisdiction in the State courts and State agencies, where it belongs.

We have a preemption problem. If the Taft-Hartley law preempts the States, then, as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has pointed out, we should not have a board which will say, "Although we could take jurisdiction, we will not. Therefore we are going to leave without a remedy someone who has been greatly wronged." If the Board is to say that, then Congress has the duty of placing the power back in the State agency, where it belongs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield me 1 minute more?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 1 minute more to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then I propose to offer an amendment relating to the secondary boycott, to strengthen the law so as to prevent any union official from saying to a customer of a manufacturer a thousand miles away from the scene of the dispute, "You can no longer handle the products of that manufacturer," and place a picket line around his establishment. It would prevent any union official from saying to such a businessman, "If you handle the products of a certain manufacturer, we will picket your place and shut off your supplies, and embarrass customers who come here to deal with you."

Fourth, I propose to outlaw the so-called hot cargo contracts. I think they are absolutely wrong, and should not be tolerated in a free society and a free economy.

Those are the proposals I intend to offer if title VI remains in the bill, and if the picketing provision remains in it.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 5 minutes to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

I warmly thank the Senator from Arkansas for his announced intention, in the event title VI is not eliminated, as I hope it will be, and the other provision which he has mentioned is not eliminated, to offer some really meaningful amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. He will have the support of at least one other Senator, the Senator from Florida.

I believe that the bill, insofar as its puny attempts to amend the Taft-Hartley Act are concerned, is contemptuous of the hard work of the committee which the Senator from Arkansas has so ably headed, and from which he has brought forth so many findings in which the people are interested. The bill is contemptuous of the attitude of the good people of the Nation, including millions who are within the labor organizations, and who know perfectly well that changes should be made for their protection, as well as for the protection of the general public.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks Senate bill 1386, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, which he expects to propose as an amendment in this debate, on the subject of requiring the National Labor Relations Board to indicate promptly what it does not intend to take jurisdiction of, and allowing the States to take jurisdiction in those fields.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1386) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to permit the exercise by the States of jurisdiction over labor disputes to which such act applies but over which the National Labor Relations Board does not exercise jurisdiction, was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:*

"(c) (1) Within thirty days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Board shall clearly establish and publish, by rule or otherwise, such limitations on its exercise of jurisdiction as it proposes to observe for the purpose of excluding from its jurisdiction those labor disputes which, in the opinion of the Board, do not have sufficient effect on commerce to warrant the exercise of its jurisdiction.

"(2) The Board in the same manner may establish and publish modifications of such limitations on its exercise of jurisdiction as it has established pursuant to paragraph (1), but no such modification shall have the effect of staying or otherwise affecting any proceeding duly instituted before any appropriate court or agency of any State or Territory (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands) prior to the expiration of thirty days' publication of such modification.

"(3) In any case or class of cases involving a labor dispute or labor disputes which the Board, pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2), has excluded from its exercise of jurisdiction, or in any case in which the Board is precluded from exercising jurisdiction because of the failure of a labor organization to file any report or other data as required by law, no court or agency of any State or Territory (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands) shall be precluded from asserting jurisdiction by vir-



tue of the fact that such case or class of cases involves a labor dispute or labor disputes affecting commerce.

"(4) Any person may petition the Board for a determination as to whether a particular case involving a labor dispute falls within the limitations on its exercise of jurisdiction established pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2). Notice of such petition and its contents shall be given contemporaneously by the petitioner to any known interested person or his representative, and such notice shall have the effect of staying any proceeding to which the petition refers explicitly, and to which both petitioner and any person or persons given such notice are the parties. Any person given notice may file an answer with the Board not later than ten days after receiving such notice. The Board's determination, unless arbitrary, shall be final and binding upon the petitioner and upon all parties notified by petitioner as provided in this paragraph. If the Board should make no determination within thirty days after the filing of the initial petition, it shall be presumed that the Board has determined to be outside its jurisdiction any case to which the petition explicitly refers, and to which petitioner and any person or persons given appropriate notice are the parties."

Sec. 2. Section 10(a) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by repealing the proviso thereto.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am also deeply concerned about another subject matter, namely, the attitude of the National Labor Relations Board toward the hotels of the Nation. The hotels in my own State and in every other State are independent enterprises, in the main; enterprises which are intrastate in character; enterprises which, because of their great variety of character, are entitled to much latitude in solving their own problems.

It is clear to me that, in the original enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, it was made plain, by the record of the debate in that particular controversy, that hotels were not to be included. I believe that from the standpoint of legislative history, that debate still controls. It is still in the legislative record of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I wish to place in the RECORD certain quotations showing how clearly it was indicated that hotels were not intended to be included. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 9, page 12471. Senator Taft said:

In recent years we have seen a growing tendency on the part of the administrative agencies to extend their jurisdiction in fields previously reserved for State action. Merely because a local retail or service industry receives merchandise which has crossed State lines, it does not follow, in my opinion, that the local enterprise is one which affects interstate commerce. A hotel performs its services within four walls. It ships nothing into commerce. It produces no goods for commerce. In my opinion that act was never intended to cover the hotel industry.

Senator Pepper, formerly my distinguished colleague, and certainly an able advocate of the labor cause, then asked this question of Senator Taft:

Would the statement just made by the able Senator from Ohio apply equally to resort hotels, as well as commercial hotels, serving the general public?

The answer of Senator Taft was:

I do not believe that the act was ever intended to cover any part of the hotel in-

dustry, as we know it, whether we are considering resort hotels or the more common commercial hotel found in both cities and small towns. At least, I am sure that such was never my intention.

Mr. President, only one question was presented in the recent Supreme Court case—in the case of Hotel Employees Local 255 against the National Labor Relations Board—and that was whether the Board—the NLRB—could decline to assert jurisdiction solely on the basis of a longstanding policy, and the Court decided that single question in the negative.

It is inconceivable to me how this could be interpreted to require the NLRB to take jurisdiction over labor disputes in the hotel industry.

I hope that it will be made abundantly clear in the course of this debate, as it was then, that it is not the intention of Congress to assert Federal jurisdiction over purely intrastate businesses such as the hotel business.

So far as I am concerned, I stand ready to support the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] on this subject matter, and any other proposal which makes it clear that intrastate business is not being brought under the jurisdiction of NLRB.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have already agreed to yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that we may have control of the time, does the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] yield additional time to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 4 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to join my good friend from Florida in asserting that it was never the intention under the Taft-Hartley Act to include hotels.

As some Senators may recall, I served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare until I surrendered my position on that committee to accept membership on the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I held hearings for almost 6 years for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare before the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted into law. I also served on the conference committee which drafted the Taft-Hartley Act in its present form. At no time was it the intention to incorporate hotels under the Taft-Hartley Act. As a matter of fact, the question came up often, and we just as often determined that hotels should remain outside the Board's jurisdiction.

As the distinguished Senator from Florida has pointed out, certainly a man like Senator Taft, who was a great lawyer, as well as the former colleague of the Senator from Florida, Senator Pepper, elicited the facts as they have been stated; namely, that it was never the intention of those who fostered the Taft-

Hartley Act to include hotels, which are purely intrastate businesses.

I compliment my good friend from Florida on bringing this matter up. I am hopeful that with respect to hotels those who are now in charge of the bill will take the same position which was taken when the original Taft-Hartley Act was first discussed on the floor of the Senate.

In this connection, I might state that I have read with interest the Supreme Court decision which supposedly has stripped the NLRB of its authority to decline to entertain hotel cases. As I understand that brief opinion, it merely states that the Board cannot refuse to include the hotel industry within its jurisdiction solely on the basis of longstanding policy.

Let me emphasize again that I believe the legislative history of the Taft-Hartley Act is replete with evidence that it was never the intent of Congress to bring hotels within the coverage of the act. However, above and beyond that, I most respectfully submit that the Supreme Court was 100 percent wrong in its interpretation of the law, and the opinion it rendered. However, I think it is important to recognize that there is nothing in the Court's opinion which compels the Board to refuse to entertain hotel suits on grounds other than longstanding policy.

Now, the hotel case referred to cites as authority an earlier case, involving the issue of whether the Board must take jurisdiction over employees of a labor union, when such union is acting as an employer. In my opinion, the Court's reference to that case as grounds for its decision in the hotel case is entirely incorrect. In *Office Employees v. Labor Board* (353 U.S. 313), the Court found, and I quote:

This is particularly true when we consider the pointed language of the Congress—repeated in Taft-Hartley in 1947—that unions shall not be excluded when acting as employers.

In other words, in that case, specific language of the act denied the union the immunity from Taft-Hartley jurisdiction which it was claiming. In the hotel workers case, not only is the act silent, but the legislative history demonstrates conclusively that the Congress intended to exempt hotels from its operation.

Frankly, I am of the opinion that even section 601 of the pending bill does not, of necessity, bring hotels within the purview of the Board. It refers only to the fact that the Board should exercise its jurisdiction to the full extent permitted by the commerce clause. For my own part, I have extreme difficulty in believing that such purely intrastate operations as hotels could, by any stretch of this imagination, be construed to be in interstate commerce.

I am most hopeful, Mr. President, that the Senators handling this bill will take a reasonable position on this matter, and that they will hew to the line adopted by those of us who worked so long and hard on Taft-Hartley, namely, that hotels should not be subjected to NLRB jurisdiction.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand my good friend from Florida to contend that the Miami hotels are primarily intrastate in character and do not get a large proportion of their patronage from outside Florida?

I have had the privilege of visiting Miami only once. However, it seems to me that the overwhelming number of people who go to the hotels in Miami come from New York and from Chicago and from other places outside of Florida.

Every Sunday I read in the New York Times several pages of advertisements by Miami hotels trying to induce well-to-do New Yorkers to come to the bright sunshine of Florida and to leave their money there. Do I understand the Senator from Florida to say that the Miami hotels are primarily patronized by Floridians?

Mr. HOLLAND. I did not make that statement. I shall never make that statement. We are happy to have a place where citizens from Illinois and from other States like to visit.

However, I am happy always to depend upon the RECORD for the intent of Congress in the passage of legislation. I note that my former colleague, Senator Pepper, who certainly is as liberal as the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and certainly is as much interested in the labor union cause as is the distinguished Senator from Illinois, was not satisfied by the earlier answer of Senator Taft, which I have already quoted, and therefore asked this question of Senator Taft:

Would the statement just made by the able Senator from Ohio apply equally to resort hotels, as well as commercial hotels, serving the general public?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask another question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield again after I have finished answering the Senator's observation. My feeling is that there could not have been made a clearer case for the exemption of hotels generally, and resort hotels also, from the coverage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

When I saw that the present Supreme Court, which is always anxious to extend Federal jurisdiction into every conceivable corner, had again avoided ruling on that question in the recent case, I was even surer than I was before that no justification exists for the extension of jurisdiction of the NLRB to hotels generally. The Court narrowed the question to the one question which I have already read into the RECORD; namely, can the National Labor Relations Board decline to assert jurisdiction solely on the basis of longstanding policy, and the Court very weakly said it could not. That is very different from a ruling that the NLRB had to take jurisdiction over hotels.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Preparatory to the question let me say that the Senator from Florida has now retreated from his contention that the Florida hotels are primarily engaged in intrastate business. He has apparently implicitly conceded that they are engaged in interstate business.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I invoke the rule. The Senator from Illinois is making a statement. He is not asking a question. I may say, however, that I have not retreated an inch. I still stand by the statement, clearly made in the RECORD during the earlier debate by Senator Taft, who certainly should have known something about his own act, to the effect that hotels do business within their four walls and render services on the spot, and that they are not engaged in interstate business; therefore the National Labor Relations Board was to have no jurisdiction over them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the fact that the Taft-Hartley law was merely an amendment to the earlier Wagner Act, passed in 1935, and that the main jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board was mapped out by the Wagner Act, and that, excellent Senators as Senator Pepper and Senator Taft were, they were not in the Senate at the time when the Wagner Act was passed, and therefore their ex post facto interpretations do not constitute legislative history? Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is not aware of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 additional minutes yielded to the Senator from Florida have expired.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is aware of the fact that the contents of the Taft-Hartley Act are quite able to stand alone. The Senator from Florida participated in the debate.

The record of the debate will show that the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Ohio were the last two speakers before the final vote was had on that bill.

Unfortunately, the Senator from Illinois was not present at that time. If he had been present I believe he would have been better educated as to what was intended by the Senate and by Congress in the passage of that bill. It was never intended—as was so clearly shown by the record in many places—to extend coverage to intrastate businesses. It was never intended to cover hotels, because it was clearly observed by the leaders on both sides in the debate—the ranking Republican, Senator Taft, chairman of the Labor Committee, and the ranking Democrat on the committee, Senator Pepper—that no hotels of any sort were intended to be covered by the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has again expired.

Mr. CURTIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], concerning the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board, a statement by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS

I should like to state that I feel that decisions of the Supreme Court during the past 4 or 5 years have definitely beclouded the power of State courts to act in labor disputes, and legislation, I feel, is definitely needed to clarify this area. However, I feel that the courts have left the Board very broad discretion in deciding its own jurisdiction. I think that the cases have uniformly held that the Board can decline to exercise jurisdiction over disputes which, in its opinion, do not have a sufficient impact on commerce to warrant the exercise of jurisdiction. The courts have permitted the Board to decline to take cases both on an ad hoc basis and by the use of jurisdictional minimums under which the Board excluded cases involving business establishments having a dollar volume below a stated figure.

So far as I know, the courts have placed only two limitations upon the discretion of the Board in fixing its jurisdiction. In one of these cases, the Office Workers Union case, the Supreme Court held that the Board could not refuse to exercise jurisdiction where the employer was a labor union, since the Taft-Hartley Act specifically indicated that Congress intended the Board to treat unions as employers where they acted in that capacity. In other words, the Court stated that the Board has no discretion to decline a case when such decision flew directly in the face of the specific language of the statute.

The second limitation imposed by the courts on the Board's discretion was included in the hotel workers case, where the Court stated that the Board could not refuse to exercise jurisdiction on the sole ground of a long-standing policy. I think it should be obvious to all that no administrative body can base any decision solely on a long-standing policy; that it must have some valid reasons to support a policy. As a matter of fact, in the hotel workers case the Board had based its decision upon reasons that it had previously cited in two other cases. The Supreme Court was not asked to pass upon the validity of the reasons cited by the Board in these cases. It was merely asked to rule on a single question of whether the Board could refuse to exercise jurisdiction on the sole ground of a long-standing policy, and the Supreme Court replied in the negative. It remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings, and placed but a single limitation upon the Board's discretion. As the distinguished Senator from Florida pointed out, the district court judge clearly understood the Supreme Court's decision, and the order he entered permits the National Labor Relations Board to decline to exercise jurisdiction over all hotels as a class, so long as the Board has any reason for doing so other than a long-standing policy unsupported by fact or reason.

Since the Board stated that it was issuing jurisdictional standards for hotels because



of the Supreme Court's decision, it is obvious the Board misunderstands the Court. Therefore, it may be necessary for Congress to make it crystal clear that Congress intends the Board to devote its energies to labor disputes which have a substantial impact on interstate commerce, by giving it clearcut discretion to decline to exercise jurisdiction over purely local establishments such as hotels.

In his testimony before the Senate Labor Committee, just a month or two ago, Chairman Leedom referred to the tremendous backlog of cases now confronting the Board. He stated that this backlog arose simply because there are not enough hours in the day for the five Board members to weigh carefully all the facts in these difficult and complicated cases, to arrive at a proper decision, and to write opinions explaining such decisions. In view of this, it surprises me that the Board would voluntarily undertake to extend the use of its facilities to purely local establishments that have not heretofore been subject to the Board's jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, I wrote the Chairman a second letter February 4, in which I expressed the view that a careful study of the November 24 decision by the Supreme Court should dispel the delusion that the decision impaired the Board's discretionary powers.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 19) authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Alaska the official flag of the United States bearing 49 stars which is first flown over the west front of the United States Capitol.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2589) for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel).

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5508) to provide for the free importation of articles for exhibition at fairs, exhibitions, or expositions, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield, from my time, a half hour to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY BUILDS FOR PEACE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this is a momentous occasion for me, as it would be for anyone to address this great body on a subject of major importance. It is natural that I should have given long and careful thought to the choice of a subject that would be fitting for such an occasion. I sought to select a topic of more than transitory concern to our Nation. I wanted also to discuss a subject on which there was a need for greater public understanding, in the hope that I might be able to add some degree of enlightenment on a matter of conspicuous importance to all Americans. It has occurred to me that one subject above all others which fits these standards is the position of the United States in the world community, as expressed in our role in the collective security system and the mutual security program which provides its strength.

#### THE PERSPECTIVE OF HISTORY

It is sometimes useful in considering contemporary events to try to visualize how they would appear to some one looking back on them from some point in the future. I believe that if we had the power to look back at ourselves a decade or a century from now, we would be able to see with greater clarity that this period in our national life is a historic time of testing—a testing of our moral fiber, our foresight, and wisdom as we face the gravest threat to our existence. To a large degree, these national qualities can be measured by our attitude toward our allies and the other free countries that share our danger and that look to us for leadership. The great issue is will our response today be mean spirited, petty, selfish, or will it be with mature determination to grapple energetically with the force arrayed against us? Will we give the free world confidence in our resolve to meet and surmount the dangers that confront us? Or will it be retreat, step by step, blindly clutching our material possessions of today and giving no heed to tomorrow?

Unless above himself he can project himself, how mean a thing is man.

#### THE MEASURE OF LEADERSHIP: OUR MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

In a unique way, the action which we take on the mutual security program each year is the gauge of our readiness to move forward decisively in a role we have no choice but to assume—the leadership of the free world in its resistance to Communist aggression and in the dramatic struggle of its less industrialized members to provide a better life for their peoples.

#### COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The United States has progressed far since the Second World War in assuming the initiative and instilling courage in the other nations which stand firmly beside us against the Soviet threat. In working together, we and our friends have evolved a system of collective security symbolized in a series of treaties—NATO, SEATO, the Rio Pact, ANZUS, the Baghdad Pact, the bilateral agree-

ments with Korea, Free China, and Japan. But these treaties in themselves are only shields of paper. If they are to have meaning, we must turn them into shields of steel, welded of men and arms and economic strength. Through the mutual security program, we add our share of the ingredients to the collective security system we have created to produce free world defenses that are an alloy of toughness and resilience.

Without the money, modern arms, commodities, and economic progress which are needed to build the security of the free world, our common defense agreements would be little more than monuments of good intentions. The armies that would stand between our own shores and Communist military might would be pitifully outmatched. The societies of strategic nations would be easy marks for Communist infiltration and economic penetration.

It seems wholly logical to me that when we share a common danger with other nations, we should band together to protect ourselves. Through the sharing of common danger in the past, we have become more alert to the unpredictable tests the future may present.

The sword must pass through fire, ere it can yield, fit instrument for man to wield.

It seems logical, therefore, that in mutuality of purpose we should help each other to achieve essential defensive strength. This is what we do through the mutual security program. It is astonishing to me that some people should see this program as wasteful, inefficient, hostile to our own interests; that it is a giveaway. What do we give, if it not be strength? What do we get if it not be greater strength? My own conviction, built up through careful study of the mutual security program during my terms of service in the other House, is that this program is an essential, primary tool of our collective security policy.

Mutual security has its roots in the Marshall plan of 1948, implemented by the 80th Congress; the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949; and the mutual defense assistance program of the same year for provision of arms and training to our European allies. Today, this defense-assistance program is an integral part of a coherent program of mutual security. It is the means by which we contribute our share of the common effort to buttress the strength of NATO and our other defense agreements.

Let us examine what we are being asked to contribute as our share. The President has proposed that we provide \$1.6 billion of new appropriations for military assistance to our NATO allies and to other nations.

Let us examine what our allies are contributing to this effort. During the whole course of the military-assistance program from 1950 through 1959, the defense expenditures of our allies totaled \$141 billion—more than six times our own expenditures of \$22 billion in this common enterprise. During the calendar year 1958, our allies contributed \$19 billion of their own money to support the forces we are now being asked to

help to the total of \$1.6 billion. They have made available to us, for our own forces, 250 bases in strategic locations. They provide 5 million men in the common defense, 14,000 jets, 24,000 combat vessels.

Let us think back on the occasions when the Soviet and Chinese Communists have sought to test our resolution and our strength. Let us think of the relentless pressure of Soviet and Chinese communism as it probes, first at one place, then at another, searching for a weak point in the barricade against its expansion: Greece, Iran, Korea, Berlin—first in 1949, and now again—Malaya, the Philippines, Indochina, the Middle East, the Formosa Straits. We may be thankful that we have helped arm these free world forces. We may be thankful, for example, that we are able, through the military-assistance program, to equip South Korean forces to defend the armed boundary against communism, without having to face the alternative of massive increases in our own forces in Korea, or reductions in our defenses to the extent of inviting a new Communist attack.

We may be thankful that because of the military equipment and training we provided Nationalist China, that nation was able to stand off the military might of Communist China in the battle over Quemoy—that the Nationalists, with American equipment and American training, were able to shoot down Communist Chinese aircraft in a ratio of 8 to 1. We may be particularly thankful that because local free world forces were able to contain this Communist attack, it did not break out into a major holocaust.

#### NATO IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

I point to the NATO area as another example of the success of collective security. Recently, the foreign ministers of the NATO countries joined in Washington to observe the 10th anniversary of that historic step. What have we accomplished? Through NATO's deterrent effect, peace has been preserved in Europe, and not an inch of European territory has since come under Soviet domination. Communist strength and influence in almost every NATO country have steadily declined. NATO in Europe have been modernized and built up from fewer than 20 ground divisions in 1950, to 100 active and reserve divisions today; from fewer than 1,000 aircraft, to 5,000 planes today, with 160 air bases available to NATO forces; and from 400 ships, to 1,700 combat vessels in today's fleets.

The firm position which we and our European allies are now taking in the present Berlin crisis is possible only because of the economic and military strength and the popular morale the Marshall plan and the military assistance program have helped create in Europe.

Today, with most of the NATO countries in good economic health, our support consists in large measure of assistance in modernization, including missiles to provide the allied command in Europe with capacity for atomic retaliation. We have much to show for the past 10

years; but we must continue to encourage and help our NATO allies in keeping their forces up-to-date, if the gains of the past are to be consolidated and projected into the future. I can think of nothing more dangerous than to adopt the attitude that because we have entered the nuclear era, we can neglect the forces in Europe that bar the way to 175 Red divisions. We cannot allow NATO defense to deteriorate or become obsolete while Soviet forces that face them are being equipped with the most modern products of Communist military technology.

The Congress is being asked, this year, to make nearly \$43 billion available for our Armed Forces and for other defense purposes. This is a tremendous sum, but one well within our capacity to bear, when we set opposite it the towering threat to our lives, to our children, and to our freedom.

#### ADVICE FROM MILITARY STRATEGISTS

One fact that never ceases to amaze me is how we are heedful of the advice of our military leaders and experts in the expenditure of immense sums in the regular military budget, but we reject, or at least question, the same leaders' judgment when they offer the most potent arguments in favor of the military-assistance program, which is an integral part of our overall security plan. Mr. President, listen to the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before a committee of Congress this year:

In my judgment it would be shortsighted indeed if this Nation spent over \$40 billion in its own Military Establishment and then declined to spend the much smaller sums needed to maintain and modernize the forces of our allies which are essential to our whole defensive concept, and without which our own military expenditures would have to be enormously increased.

This is what we have been told by General Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Without our military assistance program, the United States would require more men under arms both at home and overseas. If we were to maintain forces sufficient to match the Communist bloc in military strength or resources at points of possible aggression around the world, the cost to the United States would be far in excess of the \$22 billion furnished under the military assistance program and the \$141 billion spent by our allies during the years 1950 and 1958.

Last year, when General Twining was asked by a Member of Congress whether it was more important to restore the cuts in the mutual security program or to increase the regular defense budget, he replied that these dollars would better be spent in the defense of the Nation by putting them into mutual security. The chiefs of the individual military services endorsed his view.

Finally, the President himself declared, in his message to Congress, last month:

Dollar for dollar, our expenditures for the mutual security program after we have once achieved a reasonable military posture for ourselves, will buy more security than far greater additional expenditures for our own forces.

#### DRAPER REPORT: DEFENSE IN DEPTH

Last summer, several members of the Foreign Relations Committee addressed

to the President a thoughtful letter in which they expressed fear that we were overemphasizing military assistance at the expense of economic aid and technical assistance. Recognizing the legitimate concern that perhaps we were putting too much faith in building up military forces, and were neglecting the economic side, the President appointed a group of outstanding private citizens to study the question. Seven members were civilians with long experience in national and foreign affairs, three of them were eminent men who had retired from the military service. This group—the Draper Committee—was born in an atmosphere of doubt and questioning of the value of the military program. Yet the conclusion of the Draper Committee, based on a deep and thorough analysis of the program, and supplemented by study of the operation of the program in each geographic area, is that the spending on military assistance cannot be less than in recent years. Let me quote from one section of the Draper Committee's report:

The free world's far flung defense perimeter is manned jointly by allied and U.S. forces and extends through Middle Europe, the Middle East, and around the rim of Asia to the Northern Pacific. The weapons for the allied forces defending this perimeter have very largely been furnished by our military assistance program. It is a very wide area important to our security. The nations of this area, without our help cannot defend it. Together we do have the strength. Within this perimeter are the homelands of our friends and allies and the means by which we together can maintain mutual bases, room for maneuver, defense in depth, and unrestricted use of the seas. This forward area, manned largely by allied forces, defends a complex of dispersed air bases which materially strengthen the effectiveness of our strategic deterrent. If strong and well armed forces hold these perimeter positions, then, in the event of local aggression, our friends, our allies, and we ourselves gain time for reinforcement, and equally important, for political action. These forces in being, give the free world advantages should war come; but more importantly, they represent a major deterrent to aggression and an opportunity through negotiation to avoid war itself. Also, the capacity of these forward allied forces to meet limited attack, as recently demonstrated at Quemoy, provides another and much more acceptable alternative than surrender or resort to atomic war.

The vigorous report of this eminently qualified committee convinces me even more strongly, if possible, than I was before, that the proposals made by the President are the minimum we may adopt with safety to our Nation. The President now has under careful consideration the recommendation of this select committee for an increase this coming fiscal year for appropriations for the military phases of the mutual security program. In view of the evidence, there seems no reasonable doubt that the increase in strength recommended by the committee is needed; and if the President, after careful examination of the recommendations, in the light of his great knowledge, considers that additional appropriations should be made available for fiscal year 1960, I, for one, will rely on his judgment as to timing.



I do not want to see taxes raised. I do not want an increase in the number of inductions of young Americans into the Armed Forces. Therefore, I plan to support in full measure the President's request for military assistance funds. The alternative is a defense budget increased by many times the \$1.6 billion he has asked for this purpose, plus a heavier burden of military conscription and other costs of a semimobilized state that cannot be measured in dollars. Let others advocate such onerous alternatives, if so minded. I cannot subscribe to it.

#### ECONOMIC STRENGTH—DEFENSE SUPPORT

Thus far I have spoken primarily of the military strength of our allies. We know that it is inseparable from their economic strength, and I turn now to a discussion of these vital elements of our mutual security program which are directed toward the creation of economic strength in the free world.

Twelve of the nations cooperating with us in collective security provide 3 million armed forces, nearly one-half of the total of the free world. Without exception, these nations form a belt on the southern and eastern boundaries of the Communist bloc. They are prime targets of the Communists. The risk of their geographic positions is heightened by the weakness or strain on the limited resources of their economies caused by their heavy military commitments in the free world interest.

It would be foolhardy indeed to overlook the economic health of these countries—Korea, free China, Vietnam, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Spain, and the others—in our preoccupation with the importance of their military contributions. We do not overlook it. Through economic assistance in the defense support category of the mutual security program, we enable them to maintain these needed forces without endangering their political and economic stability.

The President has asked the Congress to authorize and appropriate \$835 million for defense support. I am convinced that this is a most reasonable cost for the tremendous benefit we gain in the strength of our worldwide security position.

The alternative to providing defense support, as the President has requested, and the military contribution it sustains is either a crumbling of free world defenses under Soviet pressure or the direct provision by the United States, at an incalculably higher cost, of the military force to hold the line against the enormous military power of the Communist bloc.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The arguments that spur us to vote for the President's program of military assistance and defense support are so compelling that I wonder why it is necessary to repeat them year after year. We are in effect buying essential military protection at bargain rates. The arguments for economic development aid to our free world partners and other friendly nations may be somewhat more subtle, but are no less compelling. Looking back 10 or 50 years from now, we may speak of the great decision to help underdeveloped nations achieve

progress somewhat as we now view the Monroe Doctrine—a policy showing foreknowledge of our long-term interests and with lasting implications for the fabric of our international relations. We have already come to view the Marshall plan in this light.

#### THE CHALLENGE IN ASIA AND AFRICA

It may well be that 10 or 50 years will see the blossoming of the new nations of Africa and Asia as they burst forth to take their place in the modern world. How will our Nation be looked upon then? Will we be the last surviving remnant of a decadent civilization exposed on every side to a totalitarian host? Or will we be regarded as the mature sister state that, in its wisdom, has shown the way for these new nations to develop in peace and freedom—to its own advantage and their endless profit?

Since World War II, 21 nations, 700 million people, a quarter of the globe, have achieved independence. By far the great majority of the nations has adopted a democratic, representative form of government. This did not come about by accident. The writings and examples of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln had important influences on the new leaders of these nations. The democratic principles, economic institutions, and material well being that have brought us to world leadership exert a powerful attraction to their peoples in their struggle for true independence and economic progress.

Is it possible that we would ignore these natural bonds between us and the new nations; that we would refuse to heed their urgent cries for economic assistance—capital and skills—and leave a void that can only benefit the Communists?

#### THE PRICE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH UNDER COMMUNISM

The leaders of the Soviet Union and Communist China see in the impatient demands for progress by these people an historical opportunity. In one hand, they hold out the example of progress under communism—their great leap forward. In the other, they hold out the enticement of economic aid. In 1958 the tempo of the economic offensive increased to \$1 billion in aid agreements with free world countries. This includes \$175 million for development projects in Egypt plus \$100 million for the Aswan Dam, \$100 million to Argentina, mostly for petroleum development, \$225 million to Indonesia—I may add, parenthetically, that is an amount exactly equal to that which the President has requested for the Development Loan Fund—\$120 million to Iraq for arms, \$40 million to Ceylon, \$41 million to Yemen, and many smaller agreements with other countries.

Let us not underestimate the appeal of the example of progress under the Communist economic system and the magnet of aid offers. We are competing for the hearts and minds of people who will no longer tolerate incomes of less than \$100 a year, life expectancies half of our own, and a bleak future for their children. If they do not move forward under moderate leadership within the democratic framework they have chosen, they will be easy prey to Communist agitators in

their midst, aggravated by the entanglements of Communist aid. These people are told by Communist propagandists that the Red remedy will cure their economic ills. What it really offers is growth under forced draft, greater sacrifice and misery for people already hungry and ragged; a new form of bondage for people who have just learned freedom.

Our answer to this should be the promise of cooperation between nations, help by the most advanced to the least advanced nations, growth in human dignity and individual liberty. The mutual security program should be our message assuring these people that we want to give them this choice. I have no doubt that they will choose the free world way.

#### CAPITAL—THE DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

Let me examine briefly what the President is asking us to approve for economic development purposes within the total requested for mutual security. First, there is the Development Loan Fund, which symbolizes the shift in policy from grants to aid on a long-term basis with repayment tailored to suit the individual abilities of the borrowing countries. Senators will recall that the President requested \$2 billion over a 3-year period when the Development Loan Fund was proposed in 1957. Actually, in the first 2 years of its operation, Congress appropriated a total of \$700 million. Implied in congressional action on the President's request was the feeling that the Loan Fund, although arising in part from a recommendation by Congress, was, after all, a new departure and should be operated on a trial basis at first.

The record of the Fund during its first 2 years of operation has been impressive. Nearly \$3 billion in firm proposals have been received. Effectively, all the capital available has been committed in sound loans to more than 30 countries. Nearly \$1.5 billion of proposals are still under consideration.

There is now before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a proposal by the President to provide a supplemental appropriation of \$225 million to keep the Loan Fund in business until fiscal year 1960 funds give it new working capital. The proposal will soon come before the whole Senate with the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee. I urge my colleagues on the committee and on the floor to support this key measure. It is a nonpartisan matter. Our action will be watched by our friends and by our adversaries. They will see it as a signal of our intentions, of our determination to be steadfast in our help to new nations in their struggle to provide their people with a decent life.

We are being asked this year, in addition to the supplemental appropriation, to provide additional capital of \$700 million for the Fund to be available starting in fiscal year 1960. It seems to me that this is not an excessive amount in view of the record the Fund has established in its first 2 years of operation and when we remember that it is the ultimate source of development capital that the underdeveloped nations have to turn to.

## EXPORTING SKILLS

The second item for economic development that we are asked to approve is technical assistance in the amount of \$211 million. This program—point 4—has proved its effectiveness over the years. Now, the increasing abilities of the underdeveloped countries to absorb technical assistance more effectively, the improved availability of American technicians, the importance of increasing our help to our Latin American neighbors, and the developing nations of Asia and Africa, have led the President to ask for an increase in funds for this program by fiscal year 1960. I think we should provide this increment in technical cooperation because, within the limit at which this assistance can be absorbed and supplied, it is one of the most efficient—and relatively one of the cheapest—ways that we can stimulate economic progress in the underdeveloped countries.

## MEETING SPECIAL NEEDS

The third category of the mutual security program that contributes to economic development is special assistance. The underlying purpose of special assistance is to achieve particular objectives of American foreign policy in the countries we help. It may be illuminating simply to read from a list of these countries to explain the need for this form of aid:

First. Libya: A newly independent nation striving for a viable economy and accepting the burden and risk of a key American airbase on its soil.

Second. Jordan: An impoverished nation under a most courageous leader which is supporting a heavy burden of military forces essential to its survival as an independent nation.

Third. Afghanistan: A nation which must have help from us to avoid total dependence on the Soviets as it fights poverty and backwardness.

Fourth. West Berlin: The symbol of freedom inside the Iron Curtain that must have our support.

Fifth. Morocco: Another newly independent nation struggling for economic progress and on whose territory we have airbases of great value to our own and free world security.

Sixth. Tunisia and Sudan: Countries whose continued independence and freedom of action are in our national interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much more time does the Senator desire?

Mr. SCOTT. I think 10 additional minutes, or 8 additional minutes, will be sufficient.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes additional to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Montana.

## FIGHTING DISEASE

I should mention here a new program proposed this year for financing from special assistance funds that could have profound implications for the future health and well-being of the people we seek to help. The success of the malaria eradication program in its third year has brought within sight the virtual removal of this worst of all killers. I have seen this program in action in Nepal and have been greatly impressed. Building on that program we now plan to undertake initial investigations looking toward community water supply programs as a means to conquer waterborne diseases. It will attack on a new front in the war against preventable diseases, a war which can be waged at relatively low cost, which produces immediate economic gains in terms of human output and responds to the Biblical challenge in the second chapter of Genesis.

## COST OF MUTUAL SECURITY

The total the President is asking for economic development assistance this year, the Development Loan Fund, technical cooperation, and special assistance, comes to \$1.2 billion. What kind of Americans are we if we tell ourselves that we are too poor to set aside from our material consumption this amount that helps to insure our future safety and assures the less advanced peoples that we stand behind them in their struggle for a better life? We are being asked to provide two-fifths of 1 percent of our national income for this purpose, at a time when our standard of living is rising at a rate of 4 percent a year. The President has declared:

We could be the wealthiest and most mighty Nation and still lose the battle of the world if we do not help our world neighbors protect their freedom and advance their social and economic progress. \* \* \* It is not the goal of the American people that the United States should be the richest Nation in the graveyard of history.

If America's security were unrelated to the fate of Indonesia or Tunisia, if we could safely remain indifferent when economic collapse led to a Communist takeover in Pakistan or India or Iran, if our bases in Spain or Libya were not essential for retaliatory striking power, if Turkey or South Korea could maintain powerful armies in the free world interest without economic support, if our industrial and military production could continue without strategic materials from abroad, then perhaps the objections to the cost of this program might have merit.

The fact is that Communist aggression is not limited to a single weapon or to an unambiguous full scale attack. Communism employs whatever means will advance its ends. The threat of economic penetration is today more immediate and potentially almost as great as the threat of intercontinental missiles. The mutual security program is our shield against the forms of Communist imperialism which cannot be met by direct force. It is our primary defense against subversion and against a shift in the balance of power. It gives hope and confidence to the newly free peoples of

the world in our determination to support their progress.

I know there are those who feel that as a Nation we have no moral responsibility for the economic welfare of the rest of the world, or who feel that the problem is so vast and our help relatively so puny that it is a hopeless undertaking.

I deplore the reasoning of those who point to this program as an alternative to domestic spending and demand that we "choose which programs we are for." These are people who would pluck the tailfeathers of the Great Bald Eagle to line the nests of their local pet projects.

We must be above preoccupation merely with post offices, dams, irrigation systems, how tall the corn grows and whether the parity is as high as an elephant's eye. This may be the last time to reflect on the grim and sobering prospect of what will confront us if for lack of an adequate mutual security program, there come a day where there be no post offices or dams or gently-waving corn.

Such attitudes are out of keeping with our national tradition and character. Our Nation stands for the dignity and worth of the individual, for progress in liberty for all of mankind, for moral law. We are firm in the belief that man, unfettered, can triumph over obstacles, however huge, that confront him. By helping others who have learned these concepts from us and who seek to apply them to achieve a better life, we reaffirm our own faith in the principles that brought us the blessings and freedom we enjoy today.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I thank the acting majority leader for his courtesy in yielding to me.

## LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1555) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield 45 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senate is now engaged in a debate on what is likely to be the most important legislation which it will be our privilege to consider during the 86th Congress. No legislation in the past decade has so totally captured the interest and conscientious attention of the American public as has the legislative subject matter currently before this great deliberative body.

Many individuals closely associated and intimately acquainted with labor-management relations in the United States have recognized for a considerable time the essential need for expansion and modification of the Federal statutes dealing with labor-management relations. But it was not until the hearings and investigations conducted by the



McClellan rackets committee that the general public became thoroughly acquainted and aware of the widespread corruption and racketeering which exists in the labor-management field. I have served on the McClellan committee since its creation, and I am currently serving as the vice chairman of that committee. I entered my duties as a member of the McClellan committee with complete objectivity and as somewhat of a novice in the field of labor relations. I have been profoundly shocked by the disclosures of corruption, violence, union-boss autocracy, and racketeering which have been made before the McClellan committee.

I daresay there is not a Member of Congress who has not spoken out in disgust against the multitude of evils which have come to light during the more than 24 months of hearings and investigations. We failed dismally in the 85th Congress to enact effective labor reform legislation. The Senate came to bat twice, and in both instances it struck out; so did the House. We failed dismally to do the job required to meet the problems specifically defined and disclosed by our investigation.

We, the Members of Congress, have told our fellow citizens that we are going to do something in the 86th Congress to rid this Nation of the evils disclosed by the McClellan committee. We have announced to our constituents that the 86th Congress will secure the rights and protect the interests of the individual members of America's labor unions. Our people have listened with solemnity to these exhortations of their elected representatives. They have reacted in a manner consistent with our grand American tradition. The citizenry of this Nation has issued a mandate to Congress, commanding us to enact effective labor reform legislation.

No mandate from the public has ever been clearer or more authoritative in its terms. The American public has directed us to enact legislation which will do a thorough job of cleaning up the ugly mess revealed by the rackets committee investigations. The people that we represent do not want legislative circumlocution. They want laws passed in the labor-management field which strike at the fundamental evils in this area. The American public is earnestly desirous of legislation which will in fact curb the dishonest, unethical, and autocratic actions of men like Hoffa, Beck, Maloney, Shefferman, Mazey, and Reuther. Our fellow citizens want legislation which will effectively protect the rights and interests of men like Tom Coffey, Roy Underwood, Desmond Berry, and Peter Batalias. They want no legislative artifices, which merely claim to accomplish these things—they want the "real McCoy" and they want it enacted by the 86th Congress. The American taxpayer has spent well over \$1 million in paying the expenses of the McClellan committee investigations. He is entitled to some dividends and some legislative returns on that investment.

Certainly the bill currently before us, S. 1555, does not satisfy the terms of the mandate issued to Congress by the American public. The committee bill is

a masterpiece of oversight, expediency, and inadequacy. Its proponents, both senatorial and professorial, extravagantly claim that S. 1555 will put Hoffa out of business. I cannot for the life of me see what provisions in S. 1555 are going to delimit the freewheeling activities of labor leaders like James R. Hoffa, unless it is hoped that Hoffa will somehow be rendered less effective by a severe case of writer's cramp, resulting from the reporting requirements of this bill. I will eagerly wager a South Dakota T-bone steak against a Boston scrod that S. 1555, if enacted, will not even slow down Mr. Hoffa, much less put him out of business. One does not have to be a Boston lawyer, a Cambridge professor, or a Secretary of Labor, to spot the many weaknesses, inadequacies, and omissions of this legislative attempt at labor reform, if it is not materially amended.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the minority counsel of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Mike Bernstein, for the outstanding statement of minority views which they have prepared on S. 1555. I commend this report to the attention of the country and of all of my colleagues. It is a comprehensive and searching legal analysis of the weaknesses, omissions, and loopholes of the committee bill.

I regret that only 45,000 copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are published and distributed to American taxpayers. I wish that 45 million copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, recording the debates and the votes on this important measure, were available, so that all our constituents, all members of labor unions, and all interested citizens could have the benefit of reading the debates, evaluating the arguments, monitoring the votes which are cast, and reading the minority views, which so clearly point out the obvious weaknesses in S. 1555, as reported from the committee by a divided vote.

An objective study of the minority report and appendix B cannot fail to convince the reader that S. 1555 simply cannot accomplish the broad reforms, so proudly claimed by its proponents. An objective reading of the minority report indicates with eloquent clarity that S. 1555 is akin to the proverbial "boy sent out to do a man's job."

Mr. President, it is indeed dismaying to me, as the vice chairman of the McClellan investigating committee to note the apparent and substantial disregard by the drafters of S. 1555 of the findings and recommendations made by the McClellan committee, after the expenditure of more than a million dollars of the taxpayers' funds and after more than 24 months of careful deliberations and almost constant hearings and investigative activity.

I am equally dismayed and appalled when I observe the casual recognition given by the majority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to the legislative proposals for labor reform which have been presented by the

Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] the able and energetic chairman of the Senate rackets committee.

With all due respect to my colleagues in the majority, who serve on the Senate Labor Committee, I doubt that there is any person currently serving in Congress who is better acquainted than is JOHN McCLELLAN with factual elements of corruption and racketeering in the labor-management field.

For the past 2 years the Senator from Arkansas has devoted his time and effort unstintingly to directing the vast investigative efforts which have provided the factual foundation for the proposed legislation we are currently considering. As a matter of fact, it is the record of these investigations which bring the proposed legislation before us in the first instance.

Consequently, it is strange, indeed, and it is almost startling, that the majority has not seen fit to use to the fullest measure the counsel and advice of the Senator from Arkansas. I regret that the McClellan recommendations have been ignored in the drafting of S. 1555. I am sure that during the debate the distinguished Senator from Arkansas will participate actively in the full discussion. His observations should be of real value in the formulation of effective labor legislation. I regret that the committee bill was not sufficiently and effectively strengthened in the committee deliberations, so that he would have found it a reflection of his efforts, and not have found it necessary to prepare and submit a substitute, which is now before us, carrying the name of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation which we are being asked by the majority to pass has received the warm endorsement of the overlords of the AFL-CIO. Let us never forget that these are the same men who a year ago told us that organized labor was fully capable of cleaning its own house without any assistance from Congress and without any new legislation.

These are the same men who by the actions of their ethical practices committee apparently continue to tolerate the abuses and corruption so abundantly existent in the International Union of Operating Engineers, for example. These are the same men who have demanded the title VI provisions of S. 1555, weakening rather than strengthening the Taft-Hartley Act, as the "quid pro quo" for their much-sought-after support.

Mr. President, these are the same men who, according to the proponents of S. 1555, will be controlled and regulated in their union-officer capacities by the various provisions of S. 1555.

I am frankly distrustful of labor reform legislation which is endorsed by the very men whose activities it purports to control. I would have been no less distrustful of the effectiveness of the Sherman Antitrust Act had it received the warm endorsement of the big business barons of the 1890's. However, it is not the endorsement of the AFL-CIO officialdom which causes my disenchantment with S. 1555 in its present form.

My reasons for opposing the proposed legislation in its present form stem from the many substantial and obvious weaknesses of S. 1555, when the bill is related to the problem defined by our investigating committee.

It seems to me to be crystal clear that if Congress is to legislate on the basis of the evidence produced by our investigating committee, and is to solve the problems which were disclosed thereby, we should certainly try to eliminate the problems which give birth to the concept of passing labor reform legislation. A careful analysis of S. 1555 convinces me that the bill in its present form fails miserably to meet that challenge.

Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss all the weaknesses and omissions of S. 1555, for I am confident that all the aspects of the majority's failure to report strong and effective labor legislation will be thoroughly aired during the cause of this great debate, and during the consideration of the 50 to 100 amendments which apparently have been or will be offered to the basic bill.

I would, however, like to discuss a few specific aspects of the bill which particularly disturb me, and which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate and the American people.

Mr. President, I first invite the attention of the Senate to title III of the committee bill. That title deals with union elections. I am particularly interested in the union election provisions, for little progress can be made in setting things right in the house of labor if rank and file members are not allowed the basic American privilege of choosing, in an atmosphere of honesty, secrecy, and fairness, the individuals who will represent their interests in negotiations with management.

I have given serious thought to the implementation of basic safeguards for the voting rights of union members in union elections, so as to safeguard voting rights which our investigating committee clearly has shown are being flagrantly violated in many unions at the present time.

On February 6 of this year I introduced S. 1002, a major portion of which was dedicated to the establishment of procedures which would workably realistically, and effectively safeguard the voting rights of the rank-and-file members of organized labor.

I appeared before the Labor Subcommittee on March 9 of this year and discussed in considerable detail the election provisions of S. 1002. These recommendations were apparently given short shrift by the majority membership of the committee. That would not disturb me if the majority had improved the title III provisions of the Kennedy bill with safeguards of their own. Minor changes have been made, but nothing of substance has been done to improve this important area of the bill. Section 301 of the committee bill is in the main a compound of worthy but totally ineffectual generalities about democracy in union elections. With the exception of 3 or 4 standards established for union elections, I daresay, it would be virtually impossible to violate sec-

tion 301, as presently found in the committee bill.

Let us look, for example, at the safeguards provided in section 301 for the nomination of candidates. Senate bill 1555 requires that "a reasonable opportunity shall be given for the nomination of candidates." Such broadly phrased requirements are valueless in the event of an election contest, for from an evidentiary standpoint they are not susceptible to the requirements of judicial proof. What, for instance, is "a reasonable opportunity"? I can conceive of a number of sets of factual circumstances which might be determined by a court as reasonable because of the difficulties involved in proving a violation of a general statutory requirement. However, with clearly defined nominating provisions required in the law, these same circumstances could easily be proven to be clearly violative of the statutory standards and to be patently abusive of individual rights.

Let us consider a union of 1,000 members, having a quorum provision allowing official business to be conducted in the presence of 8 members—and such provisions do exist in labor union constitutions today. Or even suppose it is a union having a quorum provision calling for 5 or 10 percent of the membership to be present. The union secretary, representing the incumbent officers, either announces at a union meeting or posts on the union hall bulletin board a notice that nominations will be received at the next union meeting. The incumbent officers then get their cronies together and hold a summary nominating session at the next union meeting. Certainly such practices must be recognized as discriminatory, but I doubt that in a court of law such practices could be shown to be less than reasonable under the general provisions of S. 1555. Glittering generalities such as this amount to little more than window dressing, and are utterly worthless so far as securing the rights of the individual members is concerned.

I intend to offer as an amendment at a later point in the debate the nominating procedures contained in S. 1002, which I earlier recommended to the Subcommittee on Labor. The nominating provisions of S. 1002 establish a clearly defined procedure, employing a nomination petition, which must be signed by a minimum of 2 percent of the members in good standing. A specific 60-day period is defined for the filing of nominations with certain dates set forth for the opening and closing of nominations. The secretary of the labor organization is designated to receive the petitions, and he is required to acknowledge the receipt of such petitions by a signed statement provided to the nominee. This latter requirement protects against a dishonest secretary, who might otherwise be tempted to eliminate prospective candidates through destroying their nominating petitions. When one investigates existing union-governing documents, and finds unions with quorum provisions requiring only seven or eight members to conduct official business, the need for uniform and well-defined nominating

procedures becomes immediately apparent. I sincerely hope the Senate will act to improve the committee bill in this important area.

I further recommended to the Subcommittee on Labor that the provisions of section I(a)(5) of S. 1002 be incorporated in any labor bill reported by that subcommittee. This subsection of my bill provided for the creation of a membership election committee to be established by the written designation of the various certified candidates for union office. The committee so established would be given full power and authority for the conduct of the election, including the counting of the ballots and the certification of the results. Such a committee would insure every candidate for union office that he would be represented officially during the entire course of the election, especially during the crucial period when the votes were being counted. No "shenanigans" could occur without the victimized candidate being fully advised by his representative, so that he could initiate election contest proceedings.

In brief, my bill provides for candidates for union office precisely the same safeguards which every Member of the U.S. Senate insists upon and enjoys for himself. I see no reason why candidates for office in unions and members of labor unions should not be assured of the same kind of protection for honest elections as both we and our constituents insist upon in the various States which we represent.

As a further protection my bill specifically prohibits union officers, employees, or candidates from serving on the election committee. This is to safeguard against incidents like those which occurred in the San Francisco local of the Operating Engineers, when Victor Swanson, an incumbent international vice president and candidate for reelection, actively participated in a phony count of union ballots.

Apparently this recommendation of mine must have received at least casual attention from the majority members, for they improved the Kennedy bill slightly by the inclusion at the top of page 36 of the following language:

Adequate election safeguards to insure a fair count of the ballots shall be provided, including the right of any candidate to have an observer at the polls and at the counting of the ballots.

Once again my friends across the aisle chose to employ the "broad brush" legislative approach to deal with a vital safeguard in union election procedures. Such general provisions are immediately vulnerable to manipulation and contrivance by powerful and dishonest union bosses. The general requirement in S. 1555 accords no official status to the observer at polls and includes no prescription of union officers or candidates from being present and active participants at the counting of the ballots of a union election in which the rank and file members may be attempting to depose a wily operator like Joey Fay or Johnny Dio. I am confident that a majority of the Members of the Senate will see the vital need for greater specificity



and definition in legislating safeguards and standards for union officer elections. I intend to offer as an amendment to S. 1555 the election-committee requirements contained in S. 1002.

It seems, Mr. President, that the drafters of title III of S. 1555 were unable to strike a happy medium in their legislative styling of the requirement and standards for union elections. On the one hand, as I have just discussed, title III fails, due to the extreme breadth and overly general nature of some of its requirements. On the other hand, title III has failed to provide adequate protection due to the fact that other of its provisions suffer from too much detail. In these latter cases, the drafters of S. 1555 have used what might be referred to as the "giveth and taketh away" legislative approach. They "giveth" protection to union members in one breath by the inclusion of a necessary prohibition or requirement; then in the next breath they "taketh away" with an ancillary provision, which destroys the effect of the safeguard initially established.

A classic example of the "giveth and taketh away" approach is found in subsection (d) of section 301. At one point in subsection (d) the drafters have provided that not less than 15 days prior to an election, official notification of the election will be mailed to each member at his last-known home address. This is an excellent requirement, and had the drafters been able to restrain themselves and stop right there, everything would have been just fine. But, alas, "the drafter giveth and the drafter taketh away," for then a restrictive proviso was added to exclude notification by mail if the election date is specified in the constitution and bylaws of the labor organization. The elimination of direct notice to union members as to the date, time, and place of elections denies to them a privilege accorded by law to every corporation stockholder in America.

Mr. President, I understand that during the executive consideration of the bill by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the able junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] offered an amendment to strike the aforementioned restrictive proviso. The Senator from Vermont felt as do I that union officials should not be relieved of the responsibility of notifying members as to election dates under any circumstances; however, the Prouty amendment was defeated on a straight party-line vote.

I certainly hope the Senator from Vermont will offer an amendment on the floor of the Senate to the same effect. For I do not think that an amendment providing such a basic American safeguard as election notification should be scuttled by the dark of the moon in the sequestered atmosphere of an executive committee session. I feel that the American public deserves to have this issue discussed on the floor of the Senate in open session, where the position of every elected representative will be clearly delineated.

Let us now look further to another of the "giveth and taketh away" provisions of title III.

I invite the attention of the Senate to subsection (f) of section 301. Initially this subsection prohibits the use of dues or assessment-derived union funds and any employer-derived funds to promote the candidacy of any person seeking union office. This provision might not go far enough, in that it does nothing to restrict indirect raids on the union treasury, as in the case of the UAW flower funds; but at least it would protect against direct raids on the union treasury, and in so doing it is a major step in the right direction. However, once again the ebullient drafters of Senate bill 1555 could not stem their legislative outpourings, and with an additional brief stroke of the legislative stylus they undid all of the good previously done, for in the last three lines of subsection (f) the initial restrictions are hedged by allowing dues-derived and assessment-derived union funds to be used for "factual statements of issues". The inclusion of the four fateful words "factual statements of issues" utterly destroys all of the protection to union members and union funds which were established in the opening lines of subsection (f). So, although the preface is perfect, the provisions of this part of the bill walk backward, instead of forward, from the standpoint of assuring clean democracy in labor unions.

Mr. President, what is the meaning of this nebulous phraseology? Who is to say that a particular campaign brochure or pamphlet is or is not a "factual statement of the issues". Mr. President, all of us in the Senate are knowledgeable and experienced veterans of the political battlefields and arenas. Is there among us one who, in utmost sincerity, thinks that it is realistically or practically possible to present, in the heat and tumult of a campaign, a statement of the issues which is totally objective, without bias or shading to either side? I think experience has taught all of us that total objectivity in an election campaign, be it State, county, municipal or union, is rarely, if ever, attainable.

Some of the most devastating campaign literature I have ever read has been presented in the format of a "factual statement of the issues"; but beneath the "factual" facade one finds a subtly expressed and artistically shaded partisan message. Is not the "factual statement of the issues" technique frequently employed by the political brain-trusters which Walter Reuther has drawn together in his Committee on Political Education? Is that not what we read in C.O.P.E.; as it moves stealthily more and more into the partisan political field? Did not David McDonald successfully campaign for reelection as international president of the Steelworkers Union by making a series of "factual" presentations of the issues involved in the campaign, financed by the dues of the union members, some of whom were endeavoring to elect an opponent who was running for that office?

Mr. President, this innocent appearing language, which has been included in

the committee bill, will, if anything, worsen—I repeat, Mr. President, it will worsen—conditions in union elections; it will worsen the situation from the standpoint of protecting the union members against being propagandized by means of the expenditure of their own funds. This language has the effect of giving a congressional license to the use of union funds for campaigning done under the guise of "a factual statement of the issues."

I do not know who is the author of those four words; but I am convinced that unless the Senate eliminates those four words, it will do new damage to the desires of millions of fine American men and women in the trade-union movement who are endeavoring to enjoy the privilege and the practice of self-determination.

I cannot believe that this Congress or any Congress wishes to place itself in the position of granting such a license to union officers. Consequently, I intend to offer an amendment striking these four innocent-appearing words from section 301(f).

I shall now conclude my criticism of the inadequacies of title III of the committee bill with a brief discussion of one further "giveth and taketh away" provision that is contained in Senate bill 1555. I refer specifically to section 305(a). In this subsection the committee has wisely provided that individuals convicted and imprisoned for an enumerated group of felonies will not be allowed to serve as an officer or executive employee of a labor organization, unless their citizenship rights have been fully restored, or unless the Secretary of Labor, based on an administrative hearing, has determined that the service of such individual in an officer or employee capacity is not contrary to the spirit of this act. Had the drafters of Senate bill 1555 seen fit to have stopped at this point, I would have no quarrel with the provisions of this subsection. I believe that individuals formerly convicted of felonies, who are making an honest and sincere attempt at reform, should be given encouragement by society. I do not believe that these individuals should be permanently deprived of their right to assume a responsible position in society, providing they have the necessary capabilities. I shall be perfectly satisfied to drop the barrier to union office and responsible union employment in the case of those whose conduct since conviction has merited restoration of their citizenship rights. I shall not interpose objection to allowing a convicted felon to serve as a union officer or employee, if he can prove to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that he has reformed and is walking in the paths of righteousness. But the drafters of Senate bill 1555 were not satisfied to lower the bar on the basis of existing State and Federal law or on the basis of an administrative hearing. No, Mr. President; they had to establish an additional, and totally arbitrary, basis for allowing convicted felons to legally assume union office. The committee bill drafters included a little proviso, beginning in line 12, on

page 42, which has the effect of removing all the restrictions previously established, if—of all things—the convicted felon has been out of prison for 5 years.

Mr. President, the woods are rather full of convicted felons who have been out of prison for 5 years, and have been in trouble almost incessantly ever since, but, because of skilled lawyers, are able to keep themselves from being put back into the penitentiary, while they drag the determination procedures through the interminable delays of our court system. Mr. President, as the author of the amendment on the floor of the Senate—and let me point out that the amendment was adopted by a ye-and-nay vote and, as I recall, the vote was unanimous, when, a year ago, we added this protection to the Kennedy-Ives bill—I certainly deplore the attempt to sabotage our provision now, by providing that such a person can qualify if he has reformed; in other words, that he can qualify if, for the past 5 years, he has stayed out of jail. We are all too well acquainted with the series of witnesses, the fifth amendment, dark glasses boys, appearing before our committee, who kept out of jail for a long while by ducking and dodging evidence and carrying their appeals to one appellate court after another.

Mr. President, the reformation of men convicted of felonious crime cannot be judged on the basis of some arbitrary chronological yardstick. Some men will start down the road to reform 60 seconds after they have committed the felony; others, unfortunately, may fritter away a lifetime with criminal involvements. Mr. President, I have witnessed the testimony of Joe Fay, Johnny Dio, and other convicted felons, who have appeared before the McClellan rackets committee. Their actions since their departure from prison certainly indicate that their future connection with the labor movement would not be in the best interests of the rank and file members or the general public. I regret that the committee drafters saw fit to place an arbitrary 5-year limitation on the proscription of felons serving in union office or union executive employment, thus, in fact, taking out many of the teeth of the Mundt amendment adopted by the Senate unanimously a year ago. I am unalterably opposed to such an unrealistic limitation, and, at the appropriate time, I shall move to have it stricken from the bill.

Mr. President, before leaving the discussion of union officer elections and democratic procedures in labor organization, I desire to express my disappointment at the failure of the committee bill sponsors to include safeguards for strike authorizations. Second only in importance to leadership selection is the vital determination to strike or not to strike. The right to strike is, indeed, a valuable right of organized labor, and I certainly would not want Congress to legislate in such a way that the effectiveness of this right as a tool of collective bargaining would be in any way diminished. But the right to strike should be exercised with intelligence, and no strike should ever be called, in my opinion, which does not clearly represent the majority judg-

ment of the individuals who will have to participate in it. It seems to me the right to strike should be exercised to advance the best interests of the members of a union, and never simply to advance the interests of a union boss.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, all too many unions do not require a vote of the membership to be taken before the calling of a strike. A study conducted by the Department of Labor in early 1954 indicated that of 112 international-union constitutions analyzed, only 63 contained provisions requiring a strike vote in the locals. This means that 49 international unions, representing nearly 5.8 million members, allowed strike authorizations without a democratic determination by the members affected. The strike determination is the single most important economic decision made by a labor organization, and I do not think such determinations should be arrived at capriciously or arbitrarily by a handful of union leaders and international representatives. They should be arrived at by the men whose families are going to suffer if a strike is unnecessarily called or prolonged, and union members should be given a full and democratic opportunity to participate in such an important economic decision, meaning so much to themselves and to their families.

The opponents of Federal statutes, requiring democratic votes to be taken before a strike is called, continually cite the experience under section 8 of the Smith-Connally Act as proof that pre-strike votes are of no material value. It is pointed out by the prestrike vote opponents that in over 96 percent of the cases where votes were taken under the Smith-Connally Act, the members voted to strike in support of their leadership's desires. I do not think the Smith-Connally experience is at all a fair test of the effectiveness of prestrike votes, for a careful reading of that act indicates clearly that the union members were in no way confronted with the contingency of unemployment and loss of pay.

Mr. President, I make this latter contention based on the powers granted the National War Labor Board in section 7 of the Smith-Connally Act and the statutory terms under which these powers were to be invoked. Section 7 granted the power to the National War Labor Board to conduct a hearing on the merits of any labor dispute which the U.S. Conciliation Service certified might lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and could not be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation. Section 7 further granted the Board the power to decide the dispute and provide, by order, the wages, hours, and all other conditions of employment at issue in the dispute. The bill was properly devised so the war effort could proceed unabated, and it is no fair test to relate the experiences of that war effort to what might happen if democratic strike provisions, written into a peacetime measure, could operate.

Certainly, Mr. President, any labor dispute and attendant negotiations which had deteriorated to the point that a strike was imminent would be of the very type and nature which the Con-

ciliation Service would certify to the Board. Once the dispute was before the Board, it would be decided and settled in such a manner as to insure that there would be no work stoppages. I contend, Mr. President, that workers and their leaders were aware of the fact that the Conciliation Service, working in wartime, in conjunction with the War Labor Board, would do everything within the realm of reason to prevent a work stoppage. They knew that they had nothing to lose by voting to strike, for there was virtually no likelihood that such a decision would result in their being "out on the bricks," with the resultant loss of wages. I vigorously contend, therefore, that the prestrike vote experience under the provisions of the Smith-Connally Act is a poorly cited example and deserves little or no recognition, as we relate this problem to the present time operations of our economic system.

I sincerely doubt that there is a rank and file union member in America who would object to Congress legislating so as to guarantee him the full right to participate in a strike determination by democratic secret ballot.

Senate bill 1002, my own labor bill, which I discussed before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, establishes a formula of democratic procedures for obtaining strike authorizations. I may well determine to offer those provisions from S. 1002 as an amendment to improve and strengthen S. 1555, as the debate on this measure proceeds.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

**Mr. MUNDT.** May I have 10 additional minutes?

**Mr. KENNEDY.** I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

**Mr. MUNDT.** As the vice chairman of the Senate Rackets Committee, I would be gravely remiss if I did not comment briefly on the failure to include in S. 1555 Taft-Hartley amendments which are germane to the findings of the Rackets Committee. I refer, of course, to amendments tightening the secondary boycott language and prohibiting blackmail picketing. Mr. President, the McClellan committee, in the past 15 to 25 months has conducted extensive hearings on the subject of secondary boycotts and blackmail and stranger picketing. These hearings have made it abundantly clear that these two coercive techniques are the most devastating levers used by corrupt union officials to extort money from small employers and to force employees to join specific unions against their will.

Witness after witness after witness, both from the ranks of labor and management, have said, under oath, that legislation illegalizing blackmail picketing would have prevented the kind of abuses which they were called upon to testify before the committee.

The evidence before the McClellan committee is voluminous and dramatic in support of corrective legislation with respect to secondary boycotts and certain types of coercive picketing. I can-



not understand why the sponsors of S. 1555 are reluctant to legislate in this field. They tell us that the inclusion of such Taft-Hartley changes might seriously endanger passage of any labor reform legislation. This statement would seem to beg the question, "Whose support of labor reform legislation will be lost by the inclusion of these Taft-Hartley amendments, which are germane to the McClellan committee investigations?" Certainly the inclusion of such amendments will not cause a loss of support among the minority members in the Senate. Certainly the inclusion of such amendments will not cause a loss of support from the distinguished chairman of the Rackets Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] who has already introduced bills providing for the needed corrective legislation, and who, during the course of my speech this afternoon, has offered a series of additional amendments to deal with specific deficiencies in the Kennedy-Ervin bill. This would seem to indicate that if passage of labor reform legislation is to be endangered by the inclusion of these two much needed Taft-Hartley amendments that the opposition must necessarily come from among the sponsors of S. 1555. Mr. President, let us not have vagueness and evasiveness on this issue. If there be opponents to these beneficial changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, let them clearly assert their position, and their reasons, instead of skirting the issue with grim predictions that all labor legislation might be lost if these amendments are included.

We are told additionally that amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act should be the subject of further study, and accordingly the leadership of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has created a blue ribbon panel of experts to study needed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act. Mr. President, all well and good, but if the Taft-Hartley amendments indicated by and related to the McClellan committee investigations are to be subjected to expert examination, why then are not the nongermane amendments contained in title VI of the S. 1555 worthy of further study by these same experts? The reason for this inconsistency of treatment is not entirely clear. The title VI amendments would seem to undercut the work to be done by the blue ribbon panel established by the majority. Perhaps, Mr. President, the exclusion of the title VI amendments, which were in the main requested by the officialdom of the AFL-CIO, would also endanger the passage of any labor reform legislation. I will leave this question to be answered by the majority sponsors of S. 1555.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the Ervin proposal to strike title VI from the bill so that all Taft-Hartley amendments may be considered by the so-called blue ribbon panel of experts. If consistency is to rule, if hypocrisy is to be eliminated, I assume we should place all Taft-Hartley Act amendments in the same category, and I assume the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Education and the Senator from

Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and their fellow committee members will also vote for the Ervin amendment to strike title VI from the bill so that all Taft-Hartley amendments may be eliminated from this bill, which we should then proceed to perfect and make it a realistic and effective labor-reform bill, for the establishment of democratic rights in labor unions.

However, Mr. President, should the Ervin amendment fail, I shall then support the substitute to title VI to be offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] at a later date, since if we are to include Taft-Hartley amendments in this bill, I much prefer that approach to what is presently included in title VI. In addition, Mr. President, if the Ervin amendment fails, if the Senate decides it desires to include Taft-Hartley amendments in the bill, if the Senate decides the blue ribbon panel of experts can be trusted only with certain categories of amendments and not with others, if we are going to legislate for the whole field, and if we are not going to await the results of the panel findings, then, Mr. President, there are other corrective amendments which may well be proposed and which I shall probably support. However, it remains my conviction that in this measure we should concentrate in evolving legislation which will provide a real bill of rights for union members, which will give them the necessary democratic tools to run their own unions, and which will safeguard honest working men and women and the general public against the type of abuses which have been disclosed by our McClellan investigating committee.

Mr. President, in the consideration of this proposed legislation I devoutly hope the Members of the Senate will assume their full responsibilities as legislators as we vote on amendment after amendment. I hope we shall not see repeated what occurred a year ago, when Senator after Senator stood up to say, "I favor this proposal or that proposal and I think it is a good idea, but I do not want to vote on it now; I want to vote upon it at a later date."

Mr. President, this is the later date. Now is the time. Nobody seriously believes we are going to pass a second labor bill in the present session. I hope we will study, analyze and deliberate on this measure until it has been improved to the greatest possible degree, so that the outcome will be legislation of which every member of the United States can be justifiably proud. Personally, I favor limiting this legislation to the enactment of completely effective labor reform legislation which really corrects the abuses disclosed by our committee and which will give rank-and-file union members the democratic tools and the legislative provisions required to protect their freedoms and to promote their interests. For that reason I shall vote for the Ervin amendment to strike title III from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 5(a) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1104(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of carrying out this Act with respect to projects in the several States, there is authorized to be obligated by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12 of this Act the sum of \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and the sum of \$60,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, and the sum of \$62,100,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, June 30, 1962, and June 30, 1963. Each such authorized amount shall become available for obligation beginning July 1 of the fiscal year for which it is authorized, and shall continue to be so available until so obligated."

Sec. 2. Section 5(b) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1104(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this Act with respect to projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, there is authorized to be obligated by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12 of this Act the sum of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and the sum of \$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, and the sum of \$900,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, June 30, 1962, and June 30, 1963. Each such authorized amount shall become available for obligation beginning July 1 of the fiscal year for which it is authorized, and shall continue to be so available until so obligated. Of the sum of \$900,000 authorized by this subsection for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the following fiscal years, the sum of \$600,000 shall be available for projects in Puerto Rico and the sum of \$300,000 shall be available for projects in the Virgin Islands."

Sec. 3. Section 5 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1104), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

### "ADDITIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUND"

"(e) In addition to the sums authorized in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Administrator is authorized to obligate in his discretion the sum of \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and the sum of \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, which sums shall be available to pay the United States share of costs of any approved project, and shall be administered as a separate fund without regard to the provisions of section 6 of this Act. Each of the sums authorized to be obligated under this subsection shall become available for obligation beginning July 1 of the fiscal year for which it is so authorized, and shall continue to be so available until so obligated."

Sec. 4. (a) Section 6 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1105), is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out the second sentence of subsection (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Each amount so apportioned for a State shall, during the fiscal year for which it was first authorized to be obligated and the

fiscal year immediately following, be available only for grants for approved projects located in that State, or sponsored by that State or some public agency thereof but located in an adjoining State, and thereafter any portion of such amount which remains unobligated shall be transferred to and become part of the discretionary fund provided for by subsection (b)."

(2) Strike out subsection (c).

(b) Notwithstanding the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section, if prior to the date of the enactment of this Act a reapportionment was made to a State under section 6(c) of the Federal Airport Act, as heretofore in effect, and the fiscal year for which the reapportionment was made has not expired, any unobligated portion of the amount so reapportioned to such State shall remain available for obligation, only for grants for approved projects located in that State, or sponsored by that State or some public agency thereof but located in an adjoining State, until the end of such fiscal year, but any portion of such amount which still remains unobligated at the expiration of such fiscal year shall be transferred to and become a part of the discretionary fund provided for by section 6(b) of such Act.

SEC. 5. Section 10 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1109), is amended by inserting immediately after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

**"FACILITIES USED FOR UNITED STATES ACTIVITIES"**

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to the extent that the project costs of an approved project represent the costs of constructing, altering, or repairing that portion of any airport building required to house air traffic control activities, weather reporting activities, communications activities related to air traffic control, or any other activity of the United States with respect to which the Administrator determines that it is in the best interest of the Government to provide facilities therefor, the United States share shall be not to exceed 100 per centum of the allowable costs of such facilities. The United States share shall not include any amount attributable to the cost of constructing, altering, or repairing any other portion of an airport building, or any amount attributable to that part of a project intended for use as a passenger automobile parking facility."

SEC. 6. Section 4 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1103), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 4." and by adding a subsection to read as follows:

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Administrator to make public by January 1 of each year the proposed program of airport development intended to be undertaken during the fiscal year next ensuing."

SEC. 7. (a) Section 2(a) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1101(a)), is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (7), strike out "the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, or Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands" and insert "Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands".

(2) Amend paragraph (12) to read as follows:

"(12) 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, or the Territory of Hawaii."

(b) Section 3(a) of such Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1102(a)), is amended as follows:

(1) In the first sentence, strike out "the Territory of Alaska,"

(2) In the third sentence, strike out "the Territories, and".

(c) Section 7 of such Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1106), is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out "in the Territory of Alaska, in the Territory of Hawaii, or".

(2) Amend the section heading to read as follows: "AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PROJECTS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS".

(d) Section 9(c) of such Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1108(c)), is amended by striking

out "the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, Puerto Rico and" and inserting "Puerto Rico or".

(e) Section 10(c) of such Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)), is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out "the Territory of Alaska and".

(2) Amend the subsection heading to read as follows: "Projects in the Virgin Islands".

SEC. 8. The amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to projects for which amounts have been obligated by the execution of grant agreements before July 1, 1959, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is the later date, and, with respect to such projects, the Federal Airport Act shall continue to apply as if this Act had not been enacted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, and Mr. COTTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

# STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION OF WATER RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand there are no other speakers who desire to address the Senate at this time. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 178, Senate Resolution 48, and that the time consumed be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 48) establishing a committee to study the matter of the development and coordination of water resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 48) establishing a committee to study the matter of the development and coordination of water resources, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "a", to insert "select"; on page 3, line 7, after the name "Works", to strike out "and"; in line 9, after the name "Commerce", to insert "and two members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; all said members to be designated by the chairmen of the respective committees. The committee shall be designated 'The Senate Interim Select Committee on National Water Resources'"; after line 21, to insert:

(d) The chairman shall be chosen by the members at the first meeting.

On page 4, line 13, after the word "evaporation", to insert "and evapotranspiration"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "purpose", to insert a colon and "Provided, however, That no such contract shall become effective until submitted to the members of the special committee and approved by a majority vote thereof."; in line 12, after "January 31", to strike out "1961" and insert "1960"; in line 15, after the word "exceed", to insert "\$175,000"; and, in line 17, after the word "committee", to strike out "The chairman may designate one or more members who may act for him for the purpose of this resolution."

The additional amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were:

On page 3, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in line 9, after the word "and", in the amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in line 11, after the word "committees", in the amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to insert a comma and "at least one member designated from each of the above committees being selected from the minority membership thereof"; at the beginning of line 15, in the amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to strike out "Interim"; and, in line 20, after "(c)", to strike out "five" and insert "six" so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there shall be established a select committee which shall make exhaustive studies of the extent to which water resources activities in the United States are related to the national interest, and the extent and character of water resource activities, both governmental and nongovernmental, that can be expected to be required to provide the quantity and quality of water for use by the population, agriculture, and industry between the present time and 1980, along with suitable provision for related recreational and fish and wildlife values, to the end that such studies and the recommendations based thereon may be available to the Senate in considering water resources policies for the future.

SEC. 2. (a) The committee shall be composed of three members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, three members of the Committee on Public Works, three members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and three members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; all said members to be designated by the chairmen of the respective committees, at least one member designated from each of the above committees being selected from the minority membership thereof. The committee shall be designated "The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources".

(b) Any vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect its powers, and any vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as provided for determining the original membership.

(c) Six members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

(d) The chairman shall be chosen by the members at the first meeting.

SEC. 3. The committee shall, without limiting the scope of the study hereby authorized, direct its attention to the following matters:

(a) The character and extent of water resources projects that will be needed to be



in operation between the present time and 1980 in order to supply the water use requirements of population, agriculture, and industry, including but not limited to navigation development and hydroelectric power generation, and with appropriate provision for flood control, and the realization of recreational and wildlife values.

(b) The character of legislation that may encourage the adoption of new technical methods and improved process for increasing the usefulness of available water resources, including but not limited to weather modification, evaporation and evapo-transpiration reduction, desalination of saline and brackish waters, seepage control, waste-water salvage, and the application of nuclear energy.

SEC. 4. The committee shall transmit to the Senate not later than January 31, 1961, the results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as may at that time be found desirable.

SEC. 5. In the conduct of this study full use shall be made of the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals. The committee may divide the work among such groups and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose: *Provided, however*, That no such contract shall become effective until submitted to the members of the special committee and approved by a majority vote thereof. Full use shall be made of studies and plans prepared by executive agencies, and such agencies are requested to give the committee or any of its authorized study groups or consultants such assistance as may be required.

SEC. 6. (a) For the purpose of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis through January 31, 1960, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems desirable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(b) For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, so sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems desirable. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1961.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 48 establishes a Select Committee on National Water Resources. Favorable reports on the resolution with perfecting amendments have been made by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and by the Committee on Rules and Administration. No objection has been expressed to the resolution as amended and a considerable number of Senators have spoken in support of it.

The work which is to be done by this temporary committee is of vital importance to the entire Nation. In the West, almost from the time of first settlement, we have recognized that adequate supplies of water are indispensable for satisfactory livelihood. As the Western States have matured, their population has progressively increased, cities and communities have grown, and the economy has diversified from its beginnings of a thinly settled livestock and grain economy. This growth has brought prosperity, but we have learned that it also has greatly

intensified dependence on water supplies. Many western communities know that the next two decades will be a time of crisis for them—a time for decision whether they are to continue to grow in population and prosperity or whether the shortage of water will create an impassable barrier to the future. In the next two decades western communities must find how they can develop their full potential within the narrow limits of the water supplies available to them.

Dependence on water supplies is now recognized as nationwide. From every section of the United States, we receive requests for consideration of their water problems, many of which are similar to the long-standing western problem of inadequate water supplies. Many of the problems arise from degraded water quality, with pollution by industrial wastes as a major cause. At the same time, floods still are an annually recurring disaster; demonstrating the extent of flood-control work which remains to be done. In the field of navigation, we recognize that we are far behind modern requirements, and far behind the economic transportation requirements of the inland areas.

Solutions to these problems which are brought to us in Congress and urged upon us in person as we travel about the country, are vital to the welfare of virtually every community throughout the United States. The solution to these problems is essential to the maintenance of the living standards which characterize America. In truth, the solution to these widespread water problems is essential to the maintenance of the high levels of industrial production needed for economic strength and national security.

Because of the basic importance of these water problems, Congress must, of course, respond to the needs as they arise. We cannot afford to let any area run short of the water which it needs for its full development.

But immediately, in the Congress, in each of the States, and in virtually every community, questions arise as to how much water is needed, what projects will be required to supply it, and how much will they cost? From available data, it is clear that the requirements for water will greatly increase between now and 1980. Estimates by technical experts place this increase at somewhere between 50 and 250 percent more water than is now used. It seems probable that even such great increases can be supplied, but only by very careful and thorough coordination of the uses and the engineering plans.

It is clear also that in order to supply the amounts of water, of acceptable quality, by the time they will be needed many of the water development programs must be started soon.

It is important, too, that adequate attention be given, at all stages of these programs, to recreation and fish and wildlife needs. These activities depend on water just as much as does industry, and they daily are becoming more important in the life of our people.

Senate resolution 48 will bring together the basic information on what is needed in the field of water resources. It will provide for securing the thinking of

technical experts and qualified laymen as to the best ways to proceed. The select committee will report on these matters by January 1961, and it will submit to the Senate its recommendations on them.

MR. PRESIDENT, I feel that I need hardly urge the importance of this task. I do urge that the Senate agree to the resolution so that the select committee can make a prompt start on the large and important task assigned to it.

MR. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. MANSFIELD. I yield.

MR. GOLDWATER. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Montana for having submitted this resolution. I thank my colleagues on the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for having unanimously reported it.

We in the West have grown up with the knowledge that water is valuable. To us in the West water is as precious as gold. It has been only in recent years that residents of New York City, for example, have become aware of the keen shortage of water which they face. It has been only in recent years that Senators from Eastern States have shown any interest in reclamation. It will be recalled that in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, during the discussion of the Small Projects Act, many Senators from Eastern States who never before had expressed interest in reclamation suddenly realized that there is a shortage of water for farming and domestic purposes, in the East as well as in the Middle West. So we westerners no longer are the only ones who know what drought means. We are not the only ones who know what dry rivers look like. We are not the only ones who know about depleted lakes and springs. We are now joined by people from all over the United States.

I conclude my remarks, now that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has arrived, by saying that I hope the work of the committee will proceed immediately, and that it will be productive. It is becoming more and more apparent to those of us in the West that this is a problem of the entire Nation, to be solved by a nationwide effort.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who has always been a friend to the conservation and development of water supplies. People living in the semiarid areas are now showing friendship for those who live outside those areas, because of the great need inherent in this problem.

I am happy to see the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] in the Chamber. He has contributed a great deal to this particular proposal.

I note also the presence of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], who, as the result of a trip to Montana some years ago when we were both in the House of Representatives, became interested in the problems of reclamation in the semiarid States, and has been a consistent friend ever since.

I am also glad to see present the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Not so many years ago, as the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, there was a shortage of water in the Croton Reservoir, I believe, supplying New York City. I bring that subject to the attention of the Senate to show that this is not solely a western problem. It is a nationwide problem; and unless we get busy on it very soon it will be difficult to meet, and we shall be faced with difficulties which will be very expensive to overcome.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I commend and congratulate my distinguished friend the majority whip for bringing this resolution to the floor of the Senate.

I participated in a meeting with the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and a number of other Western Senators, at which time this resolution was originally considered. As the record will show it is their leadership along with the active support of a number of other Western Senators which provided us with this vehicle for examining America's water resources problems now and for the years to come. The list of those who have lent their support to this resolution is long, but I should like to commend particularly the National Reclamation Association, which under the guidance of its president, my good friend, Guy C. Jackson, of Anahuac, Tex., was particularly active in behalf of this resolution before the Senate Interior Committee.

The Nation in recent years has become more and more aware that the conservation, control, and development of water resources is a matter of critical national concern. I may say that we in the Southwest have known this for some time. Only recently a prolonged and devastating drought has ended in Texas. Now we see reports that the Northern Plains States are suffering from a severe shortage of water. Even in many parts of the humid East the critical nature of the problem is now recognized. While water conservation used to be considered to be almost exclusively a Western problem, the critical line has moved progressively east from the 98th meridian until now the problem is clearly one of nationwide significance.

Although this is a nationwide problem, we have not brought our full abilities to bear on its solution. And we are going to have to do just that. The most conservative estimate we have tells us that by 1980 our expanding population and industry will require at least a 50-percent increase in available water supplies.

How are we going to secure this increase? How can we best undertake a general offensive in this area? What are the relative responsibilities of the States, the National Government, and private enterprise? What are the proper roles of each of the various governmental agencies? A report of this committee should give us and the States we represent in the Senate valuable guidance in resolving these important policy questions.

I believe that the adoption of this resolution today will be one of the most constructive things the Senate has done this year. I am happy that the committee unanimously reported the resolution. I believe the Senate will unanimously agree to it.

Again I commend my friend the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for the constructive contribution he has made in the solution of the water problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank my friend from Texas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] on Senate Resolution 48.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOSS

I desire to endorse and support Senate Resolution 48, to establish a Select Committee on Water Resources. The studies and recommendations to be provided pursuant to the resolution are, I am convinced, essential to proper fulfillment of the responsibilities of the Senate, and they are basic to providing for the welfare of the Nation and its economic development and security.

First, I wish to commend the sponsor of the resolution, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the cosponsor, his distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MURRAY]. Their leadership in formulating the resolution and in bringing before the Senate a practical and effective method for dealing with water problems is an outstanding service. As I shall mention in a moment, this is extremely valuable to my own State of Utah, as well as to all our neighboring States in the West.

An able report (S. Rept. No. 145) on the resolution was presented to the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on behalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on which I am privileged to serve. I fully subscribe to that report, and I commend the junior Senator from New Mexico for the clear and concise statement of the need for the studies and recommendations. That report makes three points very clear:

1. Expanding population, agriculture, and industry will require in the next 20 years use of water somewhere between 50 and 250 percent more than present use.

2. Right now, most of the water that is immediately available and inexpensive is already in use; this means that these increased uses will have to be supplied through programs for maximum conservation, development, and coordination of existing resources, plus a bold approach to new methods such as desalting brackish waters and evaporation reduction.

3. Such water programs must be undertaken well in advance of the time when the water will be needed, because it takes 10 to 15 years or longer to bring such programs into production. That means that many of these projects should be started soon in order to meet the 1980 requirements.

This hits right to the heart of the problems of my home State. Utah is a rapidly growing State. Our population in 1950 was about 690,000, and according to the conservative estimates of the Stanford Research Institute, by 1975 the population will be about 1½ million—an 80-percent increase. Of course, we in Utah welcome this growth. It is, in a sense, peopling the desert to which our forebears dedicated themselves when they emigrated to Deseret 100 years ago. This growth results from our prospering economy, and,

in turn, this growth generates further prosperity.

But while we welcome and rejoice in these prospects of Utah's growth, we also are alarmed. People, and the agriculture and industries that support them, must have water. More people means more water. Do we have the water to match the growing population and industry of our State of Utah? Will we be able to provide the increase in Utah water supplies to match the 80 percent increase in population?

Let me say here that I am confident that Utah will find ways in which to meet its water supply problems. After all, that is the history of Utah since the pioneers descended Emigration Canyon and diverted City Creek for the irrigation of their potato planting. But although I am confident that we will solve our water supply problem, I also am alarmed at the tremendous size of the task, and the closeness of 1975 and 1980 when population is expected to be almost double the present.

This, it seems to me, is perhaps the greatest challenge that we face today, and it is one for which we must immediately marshal all our abilities and resources. For this reason, I say again that the facts and recommendations of the Select Committee on Water Resources will present are valuable and vital to my State of Utah.

I have spoken of Utah because I know that State, and because it is close to my heart. But Utah is just an example of each of the 50 States of the Nation. Each of them, though in varying ways, faces water supply crises in the coming years. In some States, the approaching crisis is like Utah's—short water supplies. Other States face appalling problems of water pollution—water supplies rendered unfit for human or even industrial use because of accumulating contamination. Other areas still are subject to devastating floods, and, as one counts the roster of the States, so one enumerates problems that must be solved—and solved soon—to keep us with our growing country.

How must we, as a nation, go about this? What part will best be done by individual private citizens and local communities, what part will best be done by the States? What part must be undertaken by the Federal Government? How much will be the cost of these necessary measures? Can we afford such expenditures? Let me say here that I believe that as a nation we cannot afford to run short of water, and that we must find ways by which to provide needed water projects, and to meet the costs involved.

These grave problems are brought to focus by means of Senate Resolution 48. This will help us in the Senate, and equally it will help the people and the officials in our home States by supplying the best information that is available.

I urge the prompt adoption of Senate Resolution 48, and I commend the sponsors and the able junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] who has submitted the excellent report on the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Sometimes we get the strange idea that water is only a western problem. If anyone takes the trouble to visit the Middle West, in the river basins themselves, and discover how many communities have run out of water, and what an amazing recession there has been in the water supply in the heartland of the country, he will discover that we have an abiding interest in the question, no less than that of the Western States.



I commend the distinguished Senator from Montana for the action contemplated in the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the agreement to Senate Resolution 48, there be printed in the RECORD excerpts from the report issued by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and its subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and also from the report issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

There being no objection, the excerpts from the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

The purpose of the resolution is to provide the Senate with factual analyses and objective recommendations that it can use in taking legislative action on water resource programs.

#### Water resource problem

Throughout the country, there is grave concern regarding the adequacy of the Nation's water resources in relation to prospective requirements. This concern arises from recognition that water use will increase greatly during the next 20 years because of the rapidly expanding population, along with even greater expansion of industrial and agricultural production.

Adequate supplies of water of suitable quality are essential to maintain desirable living conditions and necessary levels of industrial and agricultural production. Water is essential for human consumption and community uses. Agriculture, especially irrigation farming, is equally dependent on having large quantities of water for crop production, and industry now uses about as much water as does irrigation agriculture. Industrial uses of water include its direct incorporation in the industrial product, and also many indirect uses such as cooling and washing, and the production of boiler steam. Stored and flowing water is, of course, the basis of other essential elements of the economy such as hydroelectric power generation and navigation. Likewise, increasing public participation in recreation and wildlife activities calls for consideration of the dependence on water for public enjoyment of these resources.

Water for these many uses often is taken for granted, and generally little thought is given to how great is our dependence on water for every activity of daily life. However, occasional catastrophes such as sustained droughts provide sharp warnings that water supplies are not available automatically, and that careful and thorough advance preparations must be made to assure enough water when it is needed. In recent years, several of the large metropolitan areas have experienced water shortages during which the residents were on limited water rations, and the industries were tightly restricted in water use. Along with these dramatic incidents, even more alarming warnings come from the widespread lowering of ground water levels in virtually every section of the country. This is the danger sign that water use is out of balance with the annual water income.

Increased use of water in the coming years is a certainty, and it is certain also that the increase will be very large. Two principal factors cause this, one factor being the increase in population, the other factor being increase in average water use per person. Estimates of future population and future per capita water use vary within rather wide

limits, but all of them confirm the gravity of the problem. A conservative estimate of the water required by 1980 is based on an assumed population of about 210 million and only moderate increase in per capita use, but even this estimate calls for a 50-percent increase in the water supplies available. Other estimates by highly qualified experts indicate that by 1980 the increase in water requirements may be in the order of 250 percent.

Will there be enough water to meet these requirements? The Chief Hydrologist of the Geographical Survey has said: "As matters stand now, most water that is immediately available and inexpensive to use at each individual point is in use already." This means that the additional water required to supply the increased uses will have to be provided through conservation and development of water resources, and through improved coordination of the prospective uses.

There are many opportunities for increasing the supplies of water for the increased future uses. Substantial increase of water uses can be provided through conservation by means of storage and regulation of flows, and through other works for river regulation. There are also several challenging opportunities to expand the amounts of the usable supplies by new technologies for desalinization of brackish and saline waters, reduction of losses due to evaporation and evapotranspiration, seepage control, wastewater salvage, and similar applications of recent technical advances.

Such water development programs, however, must be undertaken far in advance of the requirements for the water. Even relatively small water projects take 10 to 15 years for planning and construction, and most projects that would provide substantial quantities of water take correspondingly longer time. This indicates that the projects and other measures needed to meet the 1980 requirements for water should be started in the very near future.

#### NEEDED INFORMATION

Water resource matters have been considered by the Senate since its resolution in the Ninth Congress calling for a program of improvement of the internal waterways. Consistently since that time, the Congress has taken the initiative in recognizing and responding to the water needs of the Nation and of local communities. By 1825, Congress established a general policy of Federal improvement of rivers and harbors, and this policy was perfected and enlarged in the succeeding years. An important milestone was the Reclamation Act of 1902, and another one was the Flood Control Act of 1917 which was further perfected by the Flood Control Act of 1936. A program for control of stream pollution, similarly, has developed pursuant to the congressional authorizations beginning with the 1937 act and perfected in the 1948 act.

While it thus is clear that the Congress recognizes and responds to water resource problems, the rapid upward spiral of water needs multiplies the water problems that confront the Congress. Increases in water requirements of the magnitude that are now in prospect will involve significantly increased costs, and often may involve choice among alternative plans that have markedly different costs and benefits. For these reasons, almost every water matter that is before the Congress raises such questions as:

"How much water development is needed?" and

"What level of water development costs is justified?"

Since 1949, four Presidential commissions and an advisory committee of Cabinet members have made major studies of water resource problems. The reports of these studies have been forwarded to the Congress and they provide much useful information.

These reports, however, have not been accompanied by legislative recommendations of the President, and no proposals based on these studies of water resource problems have been transmitted to the Congress in a form that could be considered for legislative action.

Four resolutions of the Senate (S. Res. 84-281, S. Res. 85-148, S. Res. 85-248, and S. Res. 85-299) express its concern for full conservation, development, and utilization of the Nation's land and water resources, and they call for programs commensurate with national requirements.

The factual analyses to be secured by this resolution will provide the basis for determining what programs and other measures, both public and private, are requisite to assure that available water resources will meet requirements between now and 1980. This factual material will relate water requirements to anticipated levels of population and production increases, and will outline in general terms the scope and character of public and private activities needed to fulfill those requirements.

#### Coordinated approach

The various uses of water are interrelated. In any area, the uses for municipalities, agriculture, navigation, hydroelectric power generation, pollution abatement, recreation, and many other potential uses of the same stream may be complementary or they may be competitive. Because of this interrelation of water uses, it is necessary in any examination of future water requirements to consider water use in its entirety.

Conservation and development activities are similarly interrelated. For example, the operations of storage reservoirs, conveyance channels, ground water pumping, and watershed treatments affect each other. Pollution, both organic and inorganic, is becoming a major problem in many areas, and withdrawals, discharges, and impoundments have important relations to water quality. These facts emphasize the need for coordinated examination of water resource program goals.

#### WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The subject matter of the needed analyses falls within the jurisdiction of four standing committees of the Senate. These are the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, on Public Works, on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and on Agriculture and Forestry. In order to secure comprehensive and coordinated examination, the resolution provides for a temporary special committee to be composed of members of those four standing committees to be designated by their respective chairmen. This select committee will be of limited duration terminating on January 31, 1961, by which time it is to report its findings and recommendations. Being a study committee, it would not, of course, impinge on the legislative functions and responsibilities of the standing committees whose jurisdiction under rule XXV is unaffected.

#### Committee program

The resolution calls for recommendations based on studies regarding:

(a) The character and extent of water resource programs that will be needed between now and 1980; and

(b) The character of legislation that will encourage new methods for increasing water supplies.

In order to be useful to the Senate, the committee's report should respond specifically and factually to questions about water resource programs such as:

(1) How much water development is needed?

(2) When is it needed?

(3) Where is it needed?

(4) What should be the pattern of water development?

(5) What levels of cost and expenditures are justifiable for future water development?

The resolution provides less than 2 years in which the select committee is to prepare its report on these and equally difficult questions. This is an extremely short time in view of the complexity of the subject and the great number of important issues that are involved. Fortunately, however, for a good many years Federal and State technical agencies have assembled the basic technical data on water resources and water uses. During the first year of its operation, the select committee should, therefore, be able to compile those facts in relation to the questions it will consider.

Two important gaps will need to be filled before this material will be useful in formulating the committee recommendations:

(1) It will be necessary to develop guides as to what amounts of water will be required in relation to various levels of population and economic activity. Stated in time periods and by geographic areas, these requirements will indicate the goals of water resource development programs.

(2) The second gap to be filled is to provide guides as to the economic limits for water development—that is, what costs per acre-foot are economically justified for water for various uses, and how much expenditure of public and private funds can be economically justified for water programs.

Another phase of the committee's program under this resolution will be concerned with new methods for development of water supplies. This is the phase of the study that has to do with desalinization, evaporation reduction, induced precipitation, and like processes. In this field, the committee should bring together the judgment of competent technical experts regarding the possibilities of the various new methods and, to the extent possible, estimates should be sought of the probable amounts of water yield and the probable cost ranges of the various methods. The views and experience of technical and industrial experts should be analyzed to bring out any suggestions regarding legislative means for encouraging new methods for water resource development.

#### Fund requirements

Because of the diversity of specialized technical material that will have to be analyzed for consideration by the committee, and also because of its temporary character, the needed factual and analytical studies can probably be secured best by placing principal reliance on existing technical organizations rather than by employment of a large committee staff. To this end, the resolution provides that the committee shall make full use of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals, as well as the studies and plans of Federal and State agencies. In addition to securing the cooperation of the agencies of the executive branch, the committee should seek to avail itself of the knowledge and information about water resources and water problems that each of the States develops through appropriate State officials. In addition, it is expected that the committee will utilize research contracts with State colleges and universities, and the research institutions, and that the major share of the funds requested will be used on such contracts. A limited number of leading authorities in the field of water resources should be available from time to time for consultation and roundtable discussions.

On this basis, it is anticipated that the committee will require only a very small professional staff of two or three persons to coordinate and interpret the research for the committee.

Other committee expenses relate mainly to the conduct of hearings in Washington and in the field. These hearings will be for the purpose of securing informed public expression regarding the substantive content of the factual analyses as they become available. Consideration by the committee of such pub-

lic expression will aid it in the formulation of its report and recommendations.

Funds required for these purposes are estimated to be \$175,000 for the period ending January 31, 1960. In accordance with the rules, this amount includes the full costs of study contracts that will extend beyond that date, all of which must be authorized before such contracts can be executed.

According to present information, only a much smaller amount is expected to be required for the final 12-month period of the committee's work.

#### HEARING ON THE RESOLUTION

A hearing on the resolution was held before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation on March 17, 1959. Witnesses in support of the resolution included the sponsors, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the cosponsor, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. Other Senators also appeared in support of the resolution, as did also the representative of the National Reclamation Association. The record of the hearing has been printed.

#### OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED STUDY

It is believed that the results and recommendations reached by the select committee will be of considerable assistance to the Senate in determining future water resources policies. The factual analyses and conclusions can guide legislative action on future water resources programs.

Additional information relative to the proposed investigation is contained in letters to Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and letters transmitted by him from Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON and Senator Senator GALE W. McGEE, which letters and accompanying budget are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND

INSULAR AFFAIRS,

March 24, 1959.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At its meeting on March 24, 1959, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs voted to report to the Senate, Senate Resolution 48, to establish a select committee on water resources. As approved by the committee, Senate Resolution 48 authorizes the expenditure of \$175,000 for the work of the select committee.

In the attached letter, Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, sets forth the purpose of the anticipated expenditures along with the budget details tabulated in the customary form. Senator ANDERSON's letter is fully supported by the action of this committee, and I recommend that your committee act on it favorably. Because of the limited time available to the committee in relation to the large and complex task assigned to it, I hope that an early report by your committee will make it possible for the select committee to start on this soon.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,

Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR  
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,

March 24, 1959.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,  
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At its meeting on March 24, 1959, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs voted to report to the Senate, Senate Resolution 48, to establish a select committee on water resources. As

approved by the committee, Senate Resolution 48 authorizes the expenditure of \$175,000 for the work of the select committee to January 31, 1960. As requested by the Committee on Rules and Administration, this letter briefly explains the purpose of the anticipated expenditures together with the budget details in the standard form of tabulation. I recommend that this letter be transmitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

As stated in Senate Resolution 48, the purpose of the work on the Committee on Water Resources is to provide information and recommendations to the Senate relative to water resource programs. Throughout the country there is grave concern regarding the adequacy of the Nation's water resources in relation to prospective requirements. This concern arises from recognition that water uses will increase greatly during the next 20 years because of the rapidly expanding population along with even greater expansion of industrial and agricultural production.

The gravity of the water resources situation is brought to focus by the fact that at the present time most of the water that is available and inexpensive to use is in use already. The next 20 years' national growth will, however, require increases in water uses estimated to be from 50 percent to 250 percent greater than present uses.

Significant or persistent water shortages would severely retard national growth by limiting economic production, and it might also endanger living standards and health conditions. This is because supplies of water of suitable quality are essential for every phase of the economy. They are essential for human and community uses, for agriculture, especially irrigation farming, and in about equal volume for the many direct and indirect industrial uses. Maintenance of water resources, is of course, vital to navigation and hydroelectric power generation that have such important functions in almost every section of this country. Adequate water supplies are indispensable for most forms of wildlife and recreational activities in which there is increasing public participation.

Water for these many uses is often taken for granted, but drought years and falling groundwater levels give us sharp warning that water supplies are not available automatically. Thorough advance preparations must be made to assure that there will be enough water of acceptable quality when it is needed. We know from experience that such advance preparations take 10 to 15 years for even relatively small projects. Much longer time is required to develop the larger projects to supply any substantial increase in usable water. This indicates that the projects and other measures needed to meet the 1980 water requirements should be started in the very near future.

There are many opportunities for increasing supplies of usable water. It can be accomplished by further storage of streamflows and other works for river regulation. There are also challenging opportunities in the application of new technologies for desalinization of saline and brackish waters, reduction of evaporation losses, induced precipitation, seepage control, waste-water salvage and similar methods.

Increases in water requirements of the magnitude that are in prospect will involve significantly increased costs, and often they may involve the choice among alternative plans with markedly different costs and benefits. For these reasons, although the Congress consistently has recognized and responded to water needs of the Nation and of local communities, it is now confronted with questions as to how much water development is needed and what level of costs is justified.

Four Presidential commissions and a committee of Cabinet members have made major studies of water resource problems



since 1949. The reports of these studies provide much useful information, but they have not been in a form for legislative action, and they have not been accompanied by any legislative recommendations of the President. Four recent resolutions of the Senate express its concern for full conservation, development, and utilization of the Nation's land and water resources, and call for programs commensurate with national requirements. The factual analyses to be secured pursuant to Senate Resolution 48 will provide the basis for determining what programs and other measures, both public and private, are requisite to assure that available water resources will meet requirements between now and 1980.

The subject matter of the needed analyses falls within the jurisdiction of four standing committees of the Senate: The Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Agriculture and Forestry. In order to secure comprehensive and coordinated examination, the resolution provides for a temporary special committee to be composed of members of those four standing committees. This select committee will be of limited duration terminating on January 31, 1961, by which time it is to report its findings and recommendations. Being a study committee, it would not impinge on the legislative functions of the standing committees.

The resolution calls for recommendations based on studies regarding (a) the character and extent of water resource programs that will be needed between now and 1980; and (b) the character of legislation that will encourage new methods for increasing water supplies.

In order to be useful to the Senate, the committee's report should respond specifically and factually to questions about water resource programs such as (1) how much water development is needed, (2) when is it needed, (3) where is it needed, (4) what should be the pattern of water development, (5) what levels of cost and expenditures are justifiable for future water development.

Fortunately, for a good many years Federal and State technical agencies have assembled the basic technical data on water resources and water uses. During the first year of its operation, the select committee should therefore be able to compile many of the facts pertinent to these questions.

Two important gaps will need to be filled before this material will be useful in formulating the committee recommendations:

1. It will be necessary to develop guides as to what amounts of water will be required in relation to various levels of population and economic activity. Stated in time periods and by geographic areas, these requirements will indicate the goals of water resource development programs.

2. The second gap to be filled is to provide guides as to the economic limits for water development; that is, what costs per acre-foot are economically justified for water for various uses, and how much expenditure of public and private funds can be economically justified for water programs.

Another phase of the committee's program under this resolution will be concerned with new methods for development of water supplies. This is the phase of the study that has to do with desalinization, evaporation reduction, induced precipitation, and like processes. In this field, the committee should bring together the judgment of competent technical experts regarding the possibilities of the various new methods and, to the extent possible, estimates should be sought of the probable amounts of water yield and the probable cost ranges of the various methods. The views and experience of technical and industrial

experts should be analyzed to bring out any suggestions regarding legislative means for encouraging new methods for water resource development.

Because of the diversity of specialized technical material that will have to be analyzed for consideration by the committee, and also because of its temporary character, the needed factual and analytical studies can probably be secured best by placing principal reliance on existing technical organizations rather than by employment of a large committee staff. To this end, the resolution provides that the committee shall make full use of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals, as well as the studies and plans of Federal and State agencies. In addition to securing the cooperation of the agencies of the executive branch, the committee should seek to avail itself of the knowledge and information about water resources and water problems that each of the States develops through appropriate State officials. In addition, it is expected that the committee will utilize research contracts with State colleges and universities, and with research institutions, and the major share of the funds requested will be used for such contracts. A limited number of leading authorities in the field of water resources should be available from time to time for consultation and roundtable discussions.

On this basis, it is expected that the committee will require only a very small professional staff of two or three persons to coordinate and interpret the research for the committee.

Other committee expenses relate mainly to the conduct of hearings in Washington and in the field. These hearings will be for the purpose of securing informed public expression regarding the substantive content of the factual analyses as they become available. Consideration by the committee of such public expression will aid it in the formulation of its report and recommendations.

Funds required for these purposes are estimated to be \$175,000 for the period ending January 31, 1960. In accordance with the rules, this amount includes the full costs of study contracts that will extend beyond that date, all of which must be authorized before such contracts can be executed.

According to present information, only a much smaller amount is expected to be required for the final 12-month period of the committee's work.

Attached is a tabulation of the estimated budget to January 31, 1960.

Because of the nonpartisan character of this inquiry into water resource requirements, and to avoid unnecessary expenditure, the budget for the committee does not provide separate minority counsel. If, however, the Rules Committee feels that direct minority representation is essential, this would require a somewhat larger staff and as a result, the funds to be allowed might need to be increased.

If desired by the Committee on Rules and Administration, I shall be very glad to appear before it in support of the budget.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,  
U.S. Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on page 5, line 5, in the amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I offer an amendment, after the words "of the" to strike out "special" and insert "select".

In other places throughout the resolution, the correction was made but at this point it was missed in some way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico to the amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining amendments of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration are agreed to en bloc.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution establishing a select committee to study the matter of the development and coordination of water resources."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I do so in order to pay tribute to the able Senator from Montana and his colleagues, who have done a fine piece of work.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON RELATIVE TO SENATE RESOLUTION 48, TO ESTABLISH A SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES

Senate Resolution 48, to establish a Select Committee on National Water Resources, is now before the Senate with perfecting amendments and a favorable report by the Committee on Rules and Administration. It was my privilege to present the favorable report on the resolution for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Before discussing the resolution, I wish to give recognition to its sponsor, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the cosponsor, his senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I know that I speak for a great number of the other Senators—probably all of them—in expressing appreciation to the authors of the resolution for the keen and broad-visioned leadership that they provide in water resource matters. Their sponsorship of this resolution is another demonstration of that leadership. The resolution brings to focus the immediacy and the urgency of the nationwide water problem. Senate Resolution 48, furthermore, provides the Senate with a practical and feasible means for coming to grips with the water problem and with the responsibilities of the Senate for water resource development.

Nationally, our water problems are now more critical than they have ever been before, and we know that they will increase in gravity in the coming years. I say this because increased use of water in the coming years is a certainty, and it is certain also that the increase will be very large. Two principal factors cause this, one factor being the increase in population, the other factor being increase in average water use per person. Estimates of future population and

future per capita water use vary within rather wide limits, but all of them confirm the gravity of the problem. A conservative estimate of the water required by 1980 is based on the assumed population of about 210 million and only moderate increase in per capita use, but even this estimate calls for a 50-percent increase in the water supplies available. Other estimates by highly qualified experts indicate that by 1980 the increase in water requirements may be in the order of 250 percent.

In discussing water supplies and requirements, I am reminded again of a startling demonstration of how our new standards of living create increased water requirements. I commented recently about a magazine illustration of a new real estate development of the moderate-price range of homes. This picture shows several square blocks of homes and, on both sides of the street every house has its own private swimming pool. Private residence swimming pools, I am told, on the average, use about 90,000 gallons of water—that is, approximately three times the average capacity. And swimming pools are now being installed in this country at the rate of about 50,000 to 60,000 new private pools per year.

I do not mean to suggest that swimming pools by themselves are a major factor in water problems—although in certain communities they have placed a terrific stress on the municipal water supply facilities. What I am pointing out is that not only is the U.S. population increasing, but also all of our municipal and industrial developments are taking far more water.

There is a significant article on the front page of the Wall Street Journal for Friday, April 10, 1959. I quote just two sentences from that article:

"If the current (population) growth curve continues, asserts the Census Bureau, the United States will contain 260 million people by 1980. That would be a leap of 84 million from today's tally and more than double the increase in any similar past period."

That same Wall Street Journal reminds us of the data that technical men have already presented about the increased rate of per capita use. At the beginning of the century, daily per capita use (including industrial use) was about 530 gallons; by 1950 this average had risen to 1,340 gallons, and the estimate for 1970 is 1,950 gallons per capita per day.

Will there be enough water to meet these requirements? The Chief Hydrologist of the Geological Survey has said: "As matters stand now, most water that is immediately available and inexpensive to use at each individual point is in use already." This means that the additional water required to supply the increased uses will have to be provided through conservation and development of water resources, and through improved coordination of the prospective uses.

There are many opportunities for increasing the supplies of water for the increased future uses. Substantial increase of water uses can be provided through conservation by means of storage and regulation of flows, and through other works for river regulation. There are also several challenging opportunities to expand the amounts of the usable supplies by new technologies for desalination of brackish and saline waters, reduction of losses due to evaporation and evapo-transpiration, seepage control, wastewater salvage, and similar applications of recent technical advances.

Such water development programs, however, must be undertaken far in advance of the requirements for the water. Even relatively small water projects take 10 to 15 years for planning and construction, and most projects that would provide substantial quantities of water take correspondingly longer time. This indicates that the projects and other measures needed to meet the

1980 requirements for water should be started in the very near future.

A great share of the responsibility for meeting the future water needs of the country is squarely on the Congress. To intelligently fulfill this obligation we must have a great deal of information concerning our present situation and our future needs that we do not have now.

It is the purpose of Senate Resolution 48 to provide this much needed information. We will get the required information if the authority is granted to proceed with the studies proposed by this resolution.

#### WORLD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York wish to speak on the labor bill?

Mr. JAVITS. No. I intend to speak on another subject.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is time limited on a matter other than the labor bill? I seek recognition on another subject than the pending measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is the time controlled upon subjects other than the labor bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not.

Mr. JAVITS. I seek recognition upon another subject.

I have been yielded 10 minutes, and I shall use it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague, the majority leader.

I am introducing for appropriate reference, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and myself, a bill to establish a World Development Corporation for the purpose of stimulating free world economic growth by increasing materially the amount of private capital which flows from the United States and other industrial nations into the less developed areas of the non-Communist world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1743) to promote an increasing flow of private capital from the United States into economically sound enterprises in other areas of the world, to enlist an ever-increasing number of individual private investors in this undertaking, to promote world peace through the expansion of mutual economic interests, to reduce gradually the need for U.S. foreign public investments and grants, to establish a World Development Corporation, and for other related purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, people like myself and many of my colleagues feel that upon the United States will rest the responsibility whether, through the use of capital and credit, we can help to bring about higher standards of living, especially in the free world, upon which will depend our success as the free world's leader, and the success of the forces of freedom, as against the competing forces of communism, which assure the underdeveloped areas that the best way whereby to bring themselves abreast of the modern world is by doing it under the Communist system.

In the areas of the world where the two systems are in direct competition, as they are in Communist China and in India, this becomes a seriously pertinent question and, indeed, the whole question of survival of free institutions in the world. The idea of a World Development Corporation is one way by which we are seeking to do what can be done on a continuing operating basis with the aid of what the free world knows the best, and that is with the aid of individuals and voluntary investments.

Operating as a worldwide equity investment agency, the World Development Corporation would obtain capital funds for investment overseas in private businesses and economic development projects primarily through the sale of stock at \$5 a share to millions of small investors with a long-range objective of \$15 billion of purchased invested capital.

The basic plan for the World Development Corporation has been developed by Benjamin A. Javits, lawyer and economist, with the assistance of Leon H. Keyserling, consulting economist and former Chairman of the President's Council on Economic Advisers.

Benjamin Javits, who is my brother, is the author of several articles and books on the subject of peace through investment, and in 1958 he traveled extensively in Europe and Asia to gain support for a World Development Corporation from leaders in government, finance and investment, international economics, business, labor, and other branches of economic activity.

Right now, as we marshal the economic, spiritual, and political resources which must be brought to bear by the United States in meeting the Communists' massive cold war offensive, we must devise a meaningful role in this grim struggle which can be played by the average citizen. The World Development Corporation is the kind of provocative, stimulating proposal which may well prove, at least in part, the solution to this vital, yet perplexing problem of giving our people a direct sense of participation in developing opportunities for the people of the world and countering the Soviet threat.

In dramatic, realistic terms, the Corporation would offer an individual even in the lower income brackets an opportunity to buy a share in world peace—to invest in the future of his family, his country, and the democratic way of life through investing in the steady, yet peaceful, economic growth and expansion of under-



developed areas in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

As citizens of the leading nation of the free world, we are well aware of the tremendous social and economic gains which have paralleled the development of our highly industrialized, private enterprise economy. Such firsthand knowledge is not possessed by the head of a family in Ceylon, Paraguay, or India where the average lifespan is 43 years or less and the per capita income rarely exceeds \$100 annually. It is this man, and millions more like him who are the prime targets of the Communist bloc nations' brand of economic warfare which has already earmarked about \$1.7 billion in economic aid alone to underdeveloped areas in the last 4 years.

I should like to emphasize at this point that Communist China within the past few years has advanced about \$120 million out of its straitened economy for the purpose of foreign economic assistance.

It is apparent that the United States will have to sustain a high level of economic aid to these areas through such instruments as the Development Loan Fund for several years to come, and in all probability it may be necessary, if we are to do the job necessary to be done to double such aid from nearly \$1 billion annually to \$2 billion a year in the next 5 years. However, we need not commit ourselves to a fiscal race with the Russians in which we match Federal dollars against rubles in the field of foreign economic aid, not if we will only capitalize on an alternative which no totalitarian Communist regime can enlist—private capital.

Presuming that a World Development Corporation is in operation and our Federal outlays for overseas economic assistance is doubled by 1964, it is not illogical to predict that in public and private funds combined, our foreign economic activity will amount to about \$7 billion a year—or almost twice the present rate of economic aid and new direct private investment.

The achievement of this interim 5-year goal—during which our net outflow of private overseas investment would increase from about \$3 billion annually to more than \$5 billion—should create the foundation and instrumentalities for a greatly enlarged long-range economic development program, with the importance of the private dollar overseas in underdeveloped areas steadily outstripping that of the public tax dollar. While the Federal outlay remains around the \$2 billion mark, the net outflow of private investment should eventually increase to about \$13 billion annually. Of that amount, about \$6 billion would flow through customary channels, responsive to the stimulative effect of \$2 billion a year of public investment, and more importantly, responsive to the effect of about \$7 billion a year of private investment through the World Development Corporation. At that point, the ratio between direct private investment and public outflow would be about  $6\frac{1}{2}$  to 1, compared with the present ratio of about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 3 to 1.

By projecting overseas the uniquely successful blend of private and public

efforts which is so basic a characteristic of the U.S. economic system, we can prove to the people of underdeveloped areas that a vital economy can produce far more under freedom than a totalitarian economy can under the push-botton economic and political control of dictatorship. With U.S. private investment stimulating a total economic assistance level approaching \$15 billion a year, the cost to the U.S.S.R. of competing would be fantastically high. In attempting to keep pace, the Communist bloc nations would almost certainly endanger their ambitious plans for industrial expansion and better living standards now being highly publicized to the threadbare populations in their own countries.

The fact remains, however, that we are now at the eleventh hour of need for searching out workable methods to expand private overseas investment and that until quite recently the whole project suffered from gross neglect. Last year, Congress enacted an amendment, which I had the honor to sponsor, to the Mutual Security Act of 1958 authorizing the State Department to prepare a special report on the role of private enterprise in advancing the foreign policy objectives of the United States. The study, made by Ralph Strauss of New York as Director under the authority of Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, was issued earlier this month under the title "Expanding Private Investment for Free World Economic Growth." It clearly envisions the need and the practicality of the approach utilized by the World Development Corporation.

In advocating the establishment of international development investment companies, the study outlines their functions which include setting up a mechanism which would accumulate private U.S. capital for investment abroad in partnership with local business, providing a private financing source from which new or expanding private enterprises in less developed countries could turn for management help, providing a private contact point in the United States where businessmen overseas can apply for private U.S. capital or technical assistance, and creating private U.S. organizations which have a strong business incentive to search out and develop private investment opportunities in the less developed countries. In essence, the proposed World Development Corporation encompasses these objectives and functions within its overall framework.

The question may be asked why should we have a World Development Corporation? The endeavor would be to get the Corporation off the ground by having the Federal Government subscribe for \$500 million of the special class B stock, which would be retired out of the investment by private individuals in class A stock, expected to attain the figure of \$15 billion, as I have described it. In that way there would not be a Government corporation, but a private corporation.

During the initial period the Corporation's management would comprise a Board of Directors and 21 members, consisting of a President and Executive Vice President appointed by the Presi-

dent of the United States and 9 members appointed from private life by the President of the United States, and additional members as I have outlined in my summary. When the Government finally got out of the business, the Board of Directors would be expected to represent the most outstanding financial and development organizations in all the free world.

It is time that Americans stopped apologizing for the profit motive which underlies our entire business system. We should turn our commercial genius to the task of merchandising the tool kit of private enterprise made up of capital, know-how, individual initiative, and resourcefulness so that it will appeal to almost a billion people who live in areas with per capita living standards now at fantastically low levels, as the most dynamic, most practical way of achieving a better life while preserving free institutions. Toward that objective, a proposal like the World Development Corporation merits the most serious consideration.

Mr. President, actually billions of dollars worth of securities are traded every day on the New York Stock Exchange. Yet think of the concern with which the appropriation of \$225 million or \$700 million for the Development Loan Fund is regarded by the Senate or the other body. I emphasize that fact to show that the tremendous resource of private investment, which is the dominant characteristic of the economic system of the United States, must somehow be enlisted in the tremendous effort which we must make, for we must utilize money and credit, while the Communists seek to utilize force and iron discipline by totalitarian government. In this competition we cannot stint with our weapons any more than they are stinting with theirs. We will not be fighting this battle effectively unless we throw into the balance the resources of our private economic system, primarily the private investment system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### SUMMARY OF BILL TO ESTABLISH WORLD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

##### GENERAL PURPOSES

The general purposes of the bill, as stated in its opening language, are: "to promote an increasing flow of private capital from the United States into economically sound enterprises in other areas of the world, to enlist an ever-increasing number of individual private investors in this undertaking, to promote world peace through the expansion of mutual economic interests, to reduce gradually the need for U.S. public investments and grants overseas, to establish a World Development Corporation, and for other related purposes."

##### MAIN FEATURES OF THE BILL

(1) A World Development Corporation is proposed as an American corporation. Its major purpose, as a worldwide equity investment agency, would be to make available funds of a private capital nature to assist in the financing of economic development projects and private business in countries other than the United States, deemed to con-

tribute to the sound economic development of the country in which the project is located. As a necessary condition of such funds, the Corporation would have to find that such project met sound economic criteria, had been undertaken after consultation with the country in which the project would be located, and that funds from other sources would not flow readily to accomplish the same purposes.

In support of this major purpose, the World Development Corporation would also be authorized, as an investment trust, to purchase minor stock interests in domestic and foreign corporations engaged in overseas development activity already in being under effective management. In further support of its major purpose, the Corporation would also be empowered to insure upon payments of appropriate premiums, to the degree found actuarially sound and in accord with the general purposes of the Corporation, a reasonable annual rate of return on the outstanding investment of any private investor in a project eligible for basic financial assistance by the Corporation.

(2) The Corporation would obtain capital funds for its operation basically by offering its class B stock for public sale, predominantly to small investors, at a price yielding \$5 per share to the Corporation. Not more than 500 million shares of this type of stock, totaling \$2½ billion, could be sold in any 1 year, and not more than 3 billion shares could be sold in the aggregate under the provisions of the bill. This would result ultimately in a maximum of \$15 billion worth of class B stock.

(3) To provide initial and temporary capital funds for its operations, the Corporation would be authorized to issue class A stock of a hundred shares of par value of \$1 million per share, totaling \$100 million. This class A stock would be subscribed to by the U.S. Government through the Secretary of the Treasury. The Corporation would also be authorized to obtain initial and temporary capital funds for its operations by issuing obligations to the U.S. Treasury, or by issuing obligations guaranteed by the Treasury. Such obligations would be authorized to be issued only during the first 6 years of the life of the Corporation, could not be issued in excess of \$500 million in any 1 year, nor could the total amount outstanding in the form of such obligations exceed \$2 billion at any time. Such obligations would be interest bearing.

(4) The bill contains various provisions for the application of the proceeds of the sale of the class B stock to the retirement of the class A stock, which would have to be retired in full in 6 years or less, and also to the retirement in full of the other obligations referred to just above, preferably within 6 years but in any event within 26 years of the initial issue.

(5) So long as any class A stock remained outstanding, the Corporation would be an independent agency of the United States, and such class A stock would be the only stock of the Corporation having any voting power so long as any of it remained outstanding. During this period, the Corporation's management would consist of a Board of Directors of 21 members, consisting of a President and Executive Vice President appointed by the President of the United States, and 9 members appointed from private life by the President of the United States, all with the advice and consent of the Senate; 6 members appointed by the President of the United States from various U.S. agencies concerned with international economic development; and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, serving ex officio. Upon final retirement of the class A stock within 6 years or sooner, and upon retirement of a sufficient amount (as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury) of the obligations issued to or guaranteed by the U.S. Treas-

ury, the exclusive voting power of the Corporation vested in its class B stock would be transferred to the class B stock. At this stage, further legislation would be proposed, in order that the Corporation subsequently would function under private ownership and management.

### CESSATION OF ATMOSPHERIC NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to commend President Eisenhower for the use of the prestige and initiative of the Office of the President in urging the Premier of Russia, Mr. Khrushchev, to accept the treaty proposal of the United States and Great Britain that all atmospheric nuclear tests be stopped, and that this proposal be regarded as a step toward the international control of nuclear weapons tests.

It is, according to the scientists, from tests within the atmosphere of the earth that the health hazard of radioactive contamination of the air comes. Therefore, it is imperative that this goal be achieved, and the accomplishment of this goal would be far preferable to the failure of the conference in Geneva.

In the capacity of Senate adviser to the conference, I was informed 1 week ago of this letter. According to the wire services, the existence of the letter was revealed by the Soviets in Geneva today. This is a matter of sufficient importance to require and justify the full and active personal attention of the President—which I know it has had—and it is a matter of sufficient significance to justify the full, active, and personal intervention by the President, with the full power and prestige of the Office of the Presidency, with the head of state of the Soviet Union.

I am glad that the President has used this direct approach. Once again, as I did 1 week ago today on the floor of the Senate, I plead with the Soviet leaders to accept this proposal on the part of the U.S. Government as one which is made in good faith and in the interest of humanity. I believe this is an achievable goal which could be a major first step on the road to better international understanding and peace.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I join with the Senator from Tennessee in expressing my appreciation of the fact that the President of the United States has added his personal endorsement to the proposal which was made to the Soviet Union a week ago that the United States and the United Kingdom would be agreeable to a ban on atmospheric tests of nuclear weapons. By lending the great prestige and importance of his Office to this proposal, the President has demonstrated the importance which the United States has attached to the necessity of reaching a successful and fair agreement at the Geneva Conference. The President's personal endorsement of the proposal means that it is no tactical maneuver calculated to give us some transient

advantage at the conference table, but is a serious proposition, earnestly made.

I am gratified that the President has gone directly to Mr. Khrushchev with it. He has plainly put it up to the Soviet leader himself to throw the door open to an agreement which can end the poisoning of the air by fallout, without jeopardy, real or fancied, to any country concerned.

Six weeks ago, on the floor of the Senate, I urged that this course be taken at Geneva. A few days ago I had occasion to place in the RECORD a chronology of events leading up to the decision to submit this proposal to the Soviet Union, a proposal which was labeled as a major change of policy in the position of the United States and the United Kingdom. Since that time, two items published in two of Idaho's leading newspapers have come to my attention. They illustrate the extent to which the press is contributing to the growing awareness and interest of the people in developments at Geneva. The first is an article published by the Caldwell Times and announces the latest proposal of our Government. The other item is an editorial comment on the proposal, published in the Lewiston Morning Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNITED STATES PRESENTS CHURCH PLAN ON NUCLEAR TEST CONTROL—RUSSIAN REACTION NEGATIVE ON SURFACE EXPLOSION BAN

[From the Caldwell (Idaho) Times, Apr. 13, 1959]

GENEVA.—The United States and Britain asked the Soviet Union today to agree to a prompt controlled suspension of nuclear weapons tests on or near the surface of the earth—leaving the problem of other types of blasts for later negotiations. Informants said the proposal provided for splitting up the test suspension problem. It was advanced as the three-power talks resumed after an Easter recess. The new U.S. proposal was in line with the plan recently presented in the U.S. Senate by Senator FRANK CHURCH.

First Soviet reaction was reported to be negative. Under the new Western plan, agreement would be reached at once on banning surface and atomic nuclear tests—the ones which cause dangerous radioactive fallout.

Such an agreement would not cover very high altitude and underground atomic and hydrogen weapons blasts. Such explosions—difficult to police in any event—could be covered in some subsequent agreement reached after the first problem had been solved, in line with Senator CHURCH's plan.

U.S. Ambassador James J. Wadsworth and British Minister of State David Ormsby-Gore proposed dividing the nuclear problem into two parts with the idea of getting quick agreement on the types of tests easiest to detect. The ending of such tests also would avoid any health hazards to the world's population.

The sources pointed out that the United States and Britain would prefer an agreement covering the entire range of tests. But the Western powers recognized that this conference, which began its deliberations on October 31, now was bogged down on East-West differences about controls.

Presumably the limited agreement now suggested as a first step would require less elaborate policing arrangements than a total



ban. The Western powers, however, want foolproof controls built into any type of agreement they sign.

The plan would ban all tests at or near ground level, which cause dangerous fallout. It would permit high altitude and deep underground blasts, which Western experts contend produce no harmful results.

Judging from the line taken in a Soviet Foreign Ministry statement Sunday, the Soviet position has not changed since the conference recessed March 19 for Easter after 5 futile months of talking.

The Soviets clearly still want a veto over any inspection and control machinery established to enforce a test ban.

Officials in Washington said that if underground and high altitude tests were exempted from the ban, adequate inspection measures might be easier to agree on. Prohibition of lower-level blasts could be more readily enforced, they said, because the fallout produced in such tests makes them much more easily detectable.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Apr. 14, 1959]

#### THE CHURCH PLAN GOES TO SOVIETS

The proposal by the United States and Britain yesterday to ban testing of nuclear weapons in the earth's atmosphere was an encouraging one—even though the first Russian reaction was to reject it.

The Western appeal called upon the Soviet Union to agree to stop testing nuclear weapons on or near the surface of the earth. These are the explosions which pollute the earth's atmosphere with radioactive fallout. They also are the explosions which are easiest to detect.

The West therefore asked the Soviet Union to agree to a suspension of tests of nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, leaving for later consideration the vexing issue of what to do about underground, underwater, and outer space explosions.

Soviet Delegate Semyon Tsarapkin's initial reaction to the Western proposal at three-power talks at Geneva was negative. "It is not acceptable," he declared. "We have got to stop everything."

However, the Soviet Union will be under considerable pressure from world opinion to weigh carefully this plan to salvage some measure of agreement from the deadlocked conference on control of nuclear weapons. If the Russians summarily reject a plan to stop the test explosions which are the easiest to detect and which cause radioactive fallout endangering the world's health, then the evidence will be pretty conclusive that they do not really want to stop testing at all. Their propaganda position in the world will be weak indeed if they reject a proposal as reasonable as this one.

Idaho citizens have particular reason to be proud of the West's latest compromise plan, incidentally, because it originally was proposed in the Senate by Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho.

More than a month ago, CHURCH said in a Senate speech:

"As a last resort, to attempt the avoidance of total failure, I strongly urge that the United States make this final proposal: An agreement to suspend further nuclear weapons tests in the earth's atmosphere, within the framework of a trustworthy and sufficient international control system, adequate to reliably detect and report any violation. Such a proposal would exclude for the present any agreement involving suspension or control of nuclear tests occurring underground, underwater, or in outer space, none of which contribute to the pollution of the air, the grave cause of so much concern."

Interestingly enough, only two Idaho newspapers, the Caldwell Times and this one, paid any editorial attention at the time to CHURCH's proposal. His plan won consider-

ably more notice, however, from newspapers and magazines of a national character—a coincidence which is rather familiar by now to Idaho's junior Senator. And it now appears that his idea was good enough to convince the Governments of the United States and Britain, even if it did not impress some of his fellow Idahoans. The big question now, of course, is whether it can convince the Russians.

While the first Soviet reaction was negative, there is still grounds for hope that the Western proposal will win approval. The Geneva Conference has been under way since last October 31. It has been deadlocked for months now on the adamant positions of Russia and the West. Russia insists that all nuclear testing should be outlawed immediately by a simple declaration of the nations involved that they will go and test no more. The United States and Britain insist that bans on testing must be accompanied by an adequate inspection system to prevent cheating. The Russians reply that an inspection arrangement would open their homeland to a network of spies probing into Soviet secrets under the guise of inspections. The West answers that it would be absurd to ban nuclear testing without safeguards to assure compliance.

If one could assume that both the Soviet and Western positions were sincere, the plan now proposed should be welcomed by both camps. It would stop the testing of nuclear weapons in the earth's atmosphere, where the world's health is threatened. It would eliminate the need for an elaborate inspection system, because explosions in the atmosphere already can be detected easily. Yet, it would assure that the rest of the world would have more to rely upon than a Soviet scrap of paper in return for a decision to stop the testing of nuclear weapons.

The question of testing above and below the earth's atmosphere would not be resolved by this plan, of course, and it would be much better to agree on a method to ban all nuclear tests if such an agreement were at all possible.

The evidence of the Geneva Conference thus far makes it clear beyond question that such an inclusive agreement is not possible, however. The issue now is whether the biggest nuclear evil can be controlled while the nations continue to search for machinery to cope with the lesser ones. The West has submitted a constructive and hopeful plan to bring tremendous progress out of hopeless deadlock. The Soviet Union should ponder carefully indeed before wrecking the conference finally with a rejection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the great interest he has shown in this field, for the imaginative leadership which he has given and which has done so much to stimulate new thought in what must be regarded as humanity's effort to clean the air from the corruption which is growing each day due to the continued explosions of nuclear bombs in the atmosphere.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho and I wish to commend him for his able efforts in this field. His efforts, like those of the junior Senator from Tennessee and those of other Senators of both parties, and like the effort of the administration, are nonpartisan in nature. This is truly a field in which public servants can and must strive with all good will.

Mr. President, in the unfortunate event that the Soviets refuse to accept this step-by-step approach, then I hope President Eisenhower will continue to

give this matter his active personal attention; that he will act unilaterally; that he will direct—and will so announce to the world—that the United States stop all atmospheric tests for a given period of time—say, 3 years—as a further demonstration of America's concern with this matter; and that he will give further invitation to the Soviets to join in such a stoppage and to join in a treaty to make the stoppage permanent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Test Bans and Law," which was published in the Chattanooga Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TEST BANS AND THE LAW

"It is not acceptable. We have got to stop everything."

This same Soviet song, verse into the hundreds of thousands, on the latest U.S. atom test proposal illustrates again the prospects for meaningful settlements with Moscow.

Acting on a new plan given important and effective impetus by Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, Washington has now offered to suspend all nuclear testing on the ground and 30 miles up into the air. It is further indicated that this country will ban such tests indefinitely whatever the Russians do, in a move fully sanctioned in the Defense Department and calculated to show the world once again our good faith in the quest for peace. It would ease the way for further agreements on underground and outer space tests.

Also importantly, this plan apparently would not necessarily involve the stationing of inspection teams on Soviet soil. Testing points on ships at sea and elsewhere could be employed to see whether the agreement was being kept.

The Soviet veto over such inspection teams has stalled the discussions in Geneva since last October. Soviet refusal to provide adequate guarantees against breach of disarmament pacts has blocked progress now for more than a decade.

But the reaction of the Soviet delegate—"not acceptable"—was immediate in Geneva.

Not only did that reaction darken the cloud over the negotiations to start May 11 at the foreign ministers' level between the Big Four Powers.

It left little doubt as to what the Soviet attitude would be toward Vice President Nixon's idea, also newly broached and important, of working toward an agreement to submit any future east-west disputes to the International Court of Justice.

U.S. agreements to abide by World Court decisions on major issues, whether or not Russia does the same, as some groups have urged, is an entirely different matter. But some way must be found to strengthen the Court's role.

The Justices of the International Court are paid \$24,000 a year, tax free. In the past 13 years the Court has disposed of 10 cases (while the U.S. Supreme Court was handling 13,000). It is the least used and to date the least effective agency of the United Nations.

But experience, including that in the \$1.3 million U.S. claim over the shooting down of an unarmed plane in the Sea of Japan, in which the Soviet Union declined the Court's jurisdiction, holds little or no promise of progress.

Still, we must keep trying. Many may have wondered why a matter of this import was raised by the Vice President rather than the President, with his added international prestige. But it is one more message to the

world that is likely to show that Soviet protestations and Soviet deeds are not the same thing.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, pursuant to the order which was entered earlier today, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 11 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 21, 1959, at 11 o'clock a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 15), 1959:

##### SECRETARY OF STATE

Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of State.

##### UNITED NATIONS

Harold M. Randall, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America to the eighth session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

##### U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

John R. Bartels, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Robert A. Inch, retired.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 15), 1959:

##### U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Frederick W. Rix	Arthur E. Vincent
Joseph C. Chighizola	Howell M. Joynes, Jr.
Loyd R. Smith	Lester H. Green
Joseph E. Franken	Eugene B. Cox
George M. P. Young	Charles W. Wicks
James W. Johns	Joseph J. Zagiba
Isadore L. Souza	John T. Renfro
Carl L. Smith	John H. Bettis, Jr.
Bernhart A. Wicks	Albert V. Carver
Frank N. Campagna	Mack E. McGuffin
Earl W. C. Harris	Hubert F. Midgett
William R. Hendricks, Jr.	Hull O. L. Tanner
Leonard E. Tarvers	John E. Simpson
Samuel N. Low	Oscar A. Erickson
Max Trepeta	Claude A. Broadus
Sherwood N. Patrick	Robert L. Walters
Albert N. Dill	Edward T. Lowe
Kenneth N. Black	Ernest N. Yaroch
James L. Cropper	Duane A. Force
Newton P. Caddell, Jr.	Ernest G. Crispi
Wayne R. Glenny	Stephen T. Watson
Lee D. Wooden	John W. Schiffbauer
Louis L. Bayers	Lawrence A. Taylor
John H. Bunting	Russell R. Hickman
John H. Westbury	Arnold S. Knudsen
John G. Schwelm	Joseph C. Gimbl
Harold R. Dycus	Wilton A. Hockenberry
	Dallas W. Palmer

The following-named person to be lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard:

David C. Klingensmith

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Robert A. Biller	Thomas W. Kirkpatrick
Robert R. Tutt	
Robert J. Ketchel	Walter W. White

Wesley Goodwin	Lawrence F. Bond
William M. Devlin	James A. Granger
Michael Abarbanell	Earl L. Sullivan, Jr.
William F. Roland	Kirk R. Kellogg
Donald L. Prince	George L. Rettie
Donald L. Frantz	Richard I. Rybacki
Ronald C. Kollmeyer	Laurence C. Kindbom
Basil D. Harrington	Joseph H. Wubbold III
Donald T. Campbell	William J. Brogdon, Jr.
Floyd D. Hunter	David A. Sumi
Richard E. Sardeson	Charles E. Moorhead
George F. Viveiros, Jr.	Jr.
Kennard M. Palfrey, Jr.	Arnold Swagerty
William G. Hicks	Richard J. Kyte
John N. MacDonald	James I. McLeish
Clifton R. Smith	Bruce S. Gathy
Norman B. Lynch	John D. Basque
Norman E. Cutts	Paul T. Thevenin
Barry C. Roberts	Robert L. Bristol
Robert G. McMahan	Lawrence J. O'Pezio
Bruce L. Solomon	James J. Rooney III
William F. Merlin	Brinton R. Shannon
Thomas P. Schaefer	Roger P. Hartgen
Robert Gillespie	Ernest G. Marsh
James Weiskittel	George R. Oberholtzer
Donald M. Taub	Joseph F. Smith
Richard D. Olsen	Vernon C. Jones
Bruce J. Kichline	Alan C. Dempsey
Don S. Bellis	John E. DeCarteret
Charles W. Faircloth	Gilbert E. Brown, Jr.
Lynn N. Hein	Parker D. Morris
Arthur K. Hounslea	John L. Callahan
Neal H. B. Benjamin	Gilbert L. Aumon
Raymond E. Womack	Ernest C. Allen
Arthur H. Wagner	Robert E. McKew
James E. Rivard, Jr.	Richard A. Blackford
LeRoy C. Melberg, Jr.	Robert I. Plattus
William M. Flanders	Edward J. Quinn
John G. Stanley	Paul D. Henneberry
William B. Mohin	John R. Ehrmann
	Benjamin K. Schaeffer

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Albert Jeremiah Allison III  
 Roger Allan Andersen  
 Richard Lee Andrews  
 Clarence Clyde Atkins, Jr.  
 Ronald Glenn Barnes  
 Anthony Christopher Beardsley  
 Richard Harry Beiter  
 Stanley Edward Bielski  
 Jason Michael Bowen  
 Robert David Brown  
 Peter Arnold Bunch  
 Garret Thayer Bush III  
 John Dominic Campbell  
 Edmond Gaines Case  
 James Alexander Chappell  
 James William Coste, Jr.  
 John Ernst Cummings  
 Thomas Joseph Cunningham  
 John Deck III  
 William Michael Devereaux  
 John Richard Edwards  
 James Edward Foels  
 Richard Willis Folker  
 Gerald Ray Foster  
 Dean Allen Frankenhauser  
 David Robert Garner  
 John William Gerometta  
 Jack Carroll Goldthorpe  
 William Bayard Hewitt  
 James Gerald Heydenreich  
 Donald Leo Hoffer  
 John Terrence Howell  
 William Burgess Howland  
 Frank James Iarossi  
 Robert Joe Imbrie  
 John Edward Irwin  
 John William Klotz  
 Otto Robert Kossmann  
 George Eric Krietemeyer  
 Edouard Wilfred LaCroix, Jr.  
 Peter Christian Fabricius Lauridsen, Jr.  
 William Philip Leahy, Jr.  
 Charles Stanley Loomore  
 Thomas Frank Marucci  
 Stephen Jay Thomas Masse  
 James Lane McDonald  
 Gerald Henry McManus  
 Robert Fritz Melshelmer

Lawrence Eric Meyer  
 James Wesley Miller II  
 Donald Leslie Millroy  
 Charles Stanley Mincks  
 Ronald Francis Miscavich  
 James Terrence Montonye  
 Thomas Norman Morrow, Jr.  
 Harold Fredrick Norton, Jr.  
 Frank Walfir Olson  
 Paul Edward Pakos  
 Bruce Albert Patterson  
 David Lemar Pepple  
 Roland Marion Polant  
 Geoffrey Thomas Potter  
 Bryson Smith Randolph  
 Robert Reynard  
 Walter Scott Rich  
 Frank John Ropiak, Jr.  
 Ralph Daniel Sanford  
 William Nolden Schobert  
 Gerald William Seelman  
 Robert Edward Shenkle  
 Andrew Harley Sims, Jr.  
 Joel Douglas Sipes  
 Bruce Clayton Skinner  
 Robert Howard Thornton  
 Joseph Edward Vorbach  
 William George Walker  
 Paul Andrew Welling  
 Robert Russell Wells  
 Floyd William White, Jr.  
 Robert Bruce Workman, Jr.

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-3, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Joseph R. Rowland, Jr.  
 Richard F. Goward  
 Kenneth M. Lumsden

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Robert E. Gardner	John F. Curry
Clayton W. Collins, Jr.	Peter D. Corson
Ralph G. Isacson	William R. Liphman
Joseph J. Bookout	Axel J. Hagstrom
Maynard J. Fontaine	David L. Abbott
Richard D. Mellette	John H. Hancock, Jr.
Eugene L. Davis	Francis M. Coonrod, Jr.
Dewey F. Barfield	
Frank J. Diersen	Donald L. Alsop
Kenneth L. Heinzen	Cyril D. Maxwell
Howard Janke	Julian W. Howell
Fleming C. Walker	Charles T. Silk
Harry W. Perdue	John F. Sutton
Bill M. Aldridge	Norvon B. Freeland
Alfred E. Spori	John M. Cogan
Aubrey R. Patten	Dale R. Foster
Walter Hamilton	Robert Burke
Billy G. Read	Gordon H. Dickman
Emmerson E. Chambers	Albert L. Olsen, Jr.
William E. White	Carl L. Lane
Kenneth G. Robertson	Donald L. Sherman
James G. Willcox, Jr.	William Senn
Robert J. Descoteaux	Milton J. Stewart
William W. Thurmond	Delmar F. Smith
Thomas M. Hall, Jr.	Johnnie Cox
Neal G. Nelson	George F. Garvy
John P. Sanken, Jr.	Harold E. Geck
Robert Casper	Robert E. LaRose
Arthur W. Lee	Robert E. Nielsen
Earle K. Hand	Daniel E. Baumbaugh
Benjamin A. Ramsey	Leon D. Lawson
John W. Colton	Charles F. Galley, Jr.
Harold W. Doan	Bruce S. Little
Raymond W. Willcox	John O. Leatherwood, Jr.
Edgar S. Hutchinson	
Frank H. Steinheiser	Hodges S. Gallop, Jr.
David A. Corey	David W. Irons
John B. Thwing, Jr.	Patrick M. Shellito
Kenneth E. White	Wilfred E. Cobb, Jr.
Raymond H. Mathison	Charlie R. Polly
Richard A. Schnase	Eugene D. Gray
Richard G. Nelson	Lee J. Kelley
Edward L. Bailey	Everett G. Walters
Charles W. Mason	

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment



to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

*To be captains*

Edward B. Brown	Edmund L. Jones
John C. Ellerbe	Kenneth S. Ulm
James C. Tison, Jr.	

*To be commanders*

Francis X. Popper	Marvin T. Paulson
Howard S. Cole	V. Ralph Sobieralski
Raymond M. Stone	Lorne G. Taylor
Lorin F. Woodcock	

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Arthur R. Benton, Jr.	Roger F. Lanier
Eugene A. Taylor	John B. Watkins, Jr.
William D. Barbee	Jack E. Guth
Herbert R. Lippold, Jr.	Robert E. Williams

*To be lieutenant*

Lavon L. Posey

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

John J. McCoy	Sidney C. Miller
Vello Kiisk	Duane L. Georgeson
Lloyd D. Thurman	Gerald D. Bradford
Phillip Rotondo	Wesley P. James
Roy W. Entz	Mart Kask
Robert W. Franklin	Ronald M. Buffington
Ben Frank Worsham	Morris J. Rothenberg
III	Bobby W. Jester
Bobby S. Woodruff	

*To be ensigns*

Richard F. Dudley	Robert L. Sandquist
Thomas B. Fox	Raymond L. Speer
Renworth R. Floyd	Larry L. Wilkerson
William L. Hart	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Robert A. Holland, B.D., pastor, Willoughby Baptist Church, Willoughby, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

God's word says according to the prophet Isaiah: *And thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left.* (Isaiah 30: 21.)

Our God and Father, as we bow ourselves before Thee, we pray Thy infinite love and wisdom upon each Member of this august body. May they be dedicated to serve the people of this Nation which Thou hast caused to grow and prosper. Let each individual search the deep recesses of his heart, and with the heart under the leadership of Thy holy spirit may Thy servants seek what is right. May they with courage discharge that sacred duty for the good of all mankind that Thy holy name might be glorified.

We pray for the President of the United States and for all men who serve with him in places of authority. May it please Thee to govern their heart and life in such a manner as to assure justice and peace among all nations until Thy kingdom is come, and all creatures bow down together to Thy kingship.

We thank Thee, O God, for Thy Son Jesus and for Thy grace that allows us communication with Thee. Forgive us our sins and lead us into ways of righteousness we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 16, 1959, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5508. An act to provide for the free importation of articles for exhibition at fairs, exhibitions, or expositions, and for other purposes.

#### ELIZABETH LUCIE LEON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2589) for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel), with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 8, after "naturalization" insert "and to be naturalized".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INTERNATIONAL FOOD-FOR-PEACE BILL OF 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, America's abundant farm production can be a tremendous blessing to a hungry world. It has long been my belief that we can win more friends with our food than with all the guns and planes we could possibly send overseas. If we can figure out ways to send rockets to the moon, we should be able to find ways of getting our surplus food to hungry people without interfering with the normal channels of trade.

As for the expense of a food diplomacy program, it now costs well over a million dollars a day just to pay storage costs on our present surpluses. And they are not doing us or anybody else any good in a warehouse.

Morally, we cannot justify letting this food lie in storage when three-quarters of the world is in need. Economically, we cannot afford to make whipping boys of our Nation's farmers just because they are doing such an effective job of food production. In times of war, they are hailed as heroes for their herculean efforts along this line. It is hardly fair to condemn them for continuing to improve their farming techniques. As anyone who is familiar with farming knows, farm production cannot be turned off and on like a hot-water faucet.

Today, I am introducing an international food for peace bill which is designed to implement the foreign policy of the United States and build toward world peace by the more effective use of our

agricultural commodities for relief of human hunger and for the economic and social development of needy countries around the world. This bill is a revision, expansion, and extension of Public Law 480, which has served a good purpose but which needs to be broadened and redirected.

One of the weaknesses of Public Law 480 is that its various programs have been parceled out to nine agencies of the Government, coordinated by two interagency committees. No one in high authority in the Government devotes full time to the administration of what is, in effect, a store which sells or otherwise distributes \$1.5 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities a year. Obviously, this situation has resulted in a veritable administrative jungle that hampers the rapid and efficient handling of the program.

My bill would eliminate the problem by establishing a Peace Food Administration directly under the President. It would be headed by a Peace Food Administrator who would have the authority to pull together the now widely scattered operations under Public Law 480 and weld them into an efficient operating unit. Effective administration is the key to success of this or any other program.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, has introduced an international food for peace bill in the Senate, and I am happy to join the Senator by sponsoring this companion bill in the House. His complete and comprehensive analysis of the need for and provisions of the proposed legislation can be found on pages 6119 through 6131 of the April 16 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Both Senator HUMPHREY and I agree that we in the United States should count our abundance of food as one of our choicest blessings. And it is a blessing which we cannot in good conscience refuse to share with the less lucky peoples of the world.

#### A NEW LOOK AT INFLATION

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, these days everybody is talking inflation, although recent opinion surveys show that the average person is pretty mixed up on just what the word means. Up in the Congress we have a wide range of studies being conducted by various committees, seeking to discover cause, effect, and cure.

The President has put in motion two broad studies: The Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, headed by Vice President Nixon, and a committee on Government Activities Affecting Prices and Costs, headed by Dr. Raymond Saulnier, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

On top of all this Government activity and interest, the unions, corporations, trade associations, college professors, and economic foundations are busily pursuing the problem and issuing

pamphlets and speeches. Activities of all these groups are reported in the press and on the air, and argued back and forth by business commentators. They are further chronicled in speeches and statements printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Is it any wonder the average citizen—worker, consumer, and stockholder alike—is confused?

In all this welter of activity—some of it based upon new theories, such as Dr. Gardiner Means' "administered price" concept, but much of it based upon well-grounded economic approaches—very little seems to have been contributed to basic facts.

For this reason, two independent studies conducted in recent months by the National Industrial Conference Board and the private economic study organization known as Econometric Specialists, Inc., are worth reviewing for the record. They bring into focus a very important aspect of the problem of inflation: The division of national income between workers and people whose savings provide the tools for production.

The Industrial Conference Board inquiry shows that after exclusion of all taxes labor gets 83.2 cents out of every dollar of income generated in the national economy, while property claims 16.8 cents. The Econometric project used a different approach but obtained substantially similar findings. This study places labor's share at 76 to 85 percent.

Both studies were based on the 1954 census, the last year for which the required figures were available.

The Conference Board study first calculated labor claims for the national economy as a whole. Separate computations were made for each of eight selected commodities to show the labor-cost constituent in their selling price: an automobile, a pound of beef, a bus ride from New York to Boston; a pack of regular cigarettes, a gallon of regular gasoline, a man's business shirt, a pair of man's work shoes, and a ton of steel.

For the national economy, after elimination of all taxes, the board summarized its findings in a table, based on sales value, which shows labor getting from 71.4 to 82.17 percent of the total.

*Labor and property claims (after taxes) as shares of total private claims on sales value*

	Labor claims	Property claims
	Percent	Percent
Automobile.....	80.1	19.9
Beef.....	71.4	28.6
Bus ride.....	87.2	12.8
Cigarettes.....	78.6	21.4
Gasoline.....	79.7	20.3
Man's shirt.....	80.4	19.6
Man's work shoes.....	74.8	25.3
Ton of steel.....	82.17	17.22

Econometric Specialists, Inc., traced total labor content in value of production for the six product groupings of carbon steel, machinery, motor vehicles, paper and paperboard, textiles, and residential housing.

#### Total labor content in value of production

	Percent
Carbon steel.....	76
Machinery.....	81
Motor vehicles.....	79
Paper and paperboard products.....	77
Textiles.....	85
Residential housing.....	84

The data provided by these two independent studies deserve nationwide attention on at least four counts:

First, the close agreement between the surveys; second, the industries and products analyzed represent basic operations that should give a valid indication of trends throughout the economy; third, the organizations conducting the research are noted for their objectivity and integrity; and fourth, these are the most authoritative figures recently available to show the share of the national income going to labor.

We ought to take a good look at studies such as these, for they tend to put this whole question of inflation into the clearest perspective yet. They help to place in proper position the chicken and the egg, as between wage costs and price increases. The conclusion seems almost inescapable that because they are so large a part of the total, rising labor costs must, in the long run, end up in rising prices.

These figures point simultaneously to the relatively small margin of total costs that represents the return to property. They show how deeply any significant increase in labor's share of the sales value of output would cut into the small margin of income that is now left for meeting property claims—for expanding the Nation's productive resources.

The records of past decades show quite clearly that it is in periods of good profits and peak capital investment by industry that industrial workers have enjoyed highest employment levels and wages.

#### CUMULATIVE LABOR COSTS

We are familiar with the term "spiraling prices," and perhaps we can summon up a picture of how price increases affect creeping inflation. But these two new studies are like a spotlight, enabling us to visualize also the part that cumulative labor costs play in the price of the final product.

In order to understand how labor costs account for such a large share of the national income, it must be remembered that purchases flow in our complex economy from original sources of raw materials to the final finished product.

As the flow of materials moves along, labor—and labor costs—are steadily being applied to it. In addition to labor costs involved in the manufacturing processes, there are also the labor costs of transportation, of packaging, of wholesaling, and finally, of retailing.

But how many consumers realize that \$300 paid for a refrigerator, for instance is made up chiefly of payroll costs accumulated along the complex route of production and distribution?

The steel in the refrigerator, for example, was sold for around \$17 when it left the mill. For a \$3,000 automobile

the required steel costs about \$290. These prices at the steel mill, in turn, include labor costs as their chief component—costs incurred not only in the mill, but all the way back to the mines.

#### NEED FOR HIGHER PRODUCTIVITY

The United States faces grave problems as the result of misunderstanding about labor costs and productivity.

To the extent that higher wage payments have been accompanied by increased productivity, they have helped to advance the country's living standards. But, the important fact is that wage increases have gone far ahead of productivity increases. Government data show that in manufacturing industry as a whole, average hourly earnings—not including wage supplements—increased by 60 percent in the 10 years 1947–56 while productivity rose by only 45 percent.

No one really gains from such inflationary wage increases. The housewife in the home of the wage earner soon finds that the newborn increase in the family's pay envelope has evaporated in higher living costs. The hardest blow is suffered by millions of others whose incomes have not gone up—the people on salaries, fixed incomes, and pensions.

#### CONSUMERS SQUEEZED BY LABOR COSTS

It hardly needs repeating that as productive efficiency increases, a share of these productivity gains should always be passed on to consumers in lower prices. But this becomes impossible when labor costs sop up all the productivity gains and much more besides.

What has been happening all across this country is symbolized by these facts in the steel industry: labor costs increased by 75 percent in the 1947–56 period, while productivity was increased by an estimated 29 percent, according to latest available BLS data.

All of this is reflected in the declining purchasing power of the consumer's dollar. The 100-cent dollar of 1940 was worth 63 cents in 1947 and by mid-1956 was worth only 49 cents.

#### FACTS TO BE REMEMBERED

The papers are full of talk about the negotiations in the steel industry. The Government is pressuring both management and labor for a settlement that will not be inflationary—that means a wage increase moderate enough not to affect prices. But who can say whether that is possible. If a product costs more, it usually ends up selling for more.

It would be well, however, for all concerned—unions, management, consumers and Government to understand three key facts underlined by the conference board and econometric studies:

First, Labor claims in 1954 accounted for 83 percent of all claims—excluding taxes—against the national output;

Second, Any new round of wage increases in a basic industry rapidly fans out through the economy by touching off demands for matching increases all along the line—in manufacturing, transportation and distribution;

Third, Each such "round" in a basic industry, and the spreading wave of



matching increases in all other industries will have clearly predictable results when not accompanied by equal increases in productivity. The increased wage bills simply force inflationary price increases everywhere along the line—in production, transportation, and distribution.

Since labor unions are subject to little control or regulation, labor leaders have it in their power either to weaken or to strengthen the national economy, according to what course of action they choose.

Companies that are forced by added labor and other costs to ask for price increases in order to stay in business find themselves under two natural restrictions. Of these, competition is the first; the second is consumer ability or willingness to pay the advancing costs.

Squeezed between these disciplines, many companies have been quite unable in recent years to cover all their increasing wage costs by adequate price rises. The evidence is in their declining profit ratios. The steel industry, for instance, has managed to match its prewar ratio on sales—8.1 percent in 1940—in only 1 year of the postwar inflation spiral.

For all manufacturing industry the ratio of profits to sales has declined from 7 percent in 1948 to 4.8 percent in 1957, according to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

One of the most dangerous consequences of inflationary wage increases—one which saps the growth power of the entire American economy—is depletion of the margin of capital available for investment in tools to increase productivity.

The importance to our economic welfare of replacement and development of tools cannot be ignored. Without the tools we now have—using only obsolete tools like those of eastern Asia—we should see our level of productivity drop to an insignificant fraction of today's.

And how were our modern tools developed? Through invention and improvement on invention, made possible in the United States by our free enterprise system of risk capital—capital accumulated a little at a time from savings and the profits of previous ventures.

Without the chance to accumulate these amounts we would still have an oxcart economy; the hand plow would still be used on our farms. We would be living much as our ancestors did—in times before the improvement, replacement, and development of tools brought this Nation, by good use of venture capital, to living standards we take for granted today.

#### GOVERNMENT CONTROLS?

One alternative to our system of risk capital does exist: Capital investment by Government, under stern political controls. Either by direct taxation or by inflation, Government would raise the required funds. But the experience of many countries with political control of industry shows the unfortunate results of political management over economic enterprise. It invariably leads to problems still greater than those it was supposed to solve.

Our American economy has flourished as the purchasing power and living standards of the people have advanced, and everyone today surely believes in the highest possible wage levels. But wage increases which overleap productivity and bring on further inflation are an attack on the welfare of all.

I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point outlines of the studies by both the National Industrial Conference Board and Econometric Specialists, Inc.:

#### NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD—THE RELATIVE SIZE OF LABOR CLAIMS, PROPERTY CLAIMS, AND TAX CLAIMS, NATIONALLY AND IN SELECTED COMMODITIES

##### EXPLANATION OF THE STUDY

In this study, definitions of labor claims, property claims, and tax claims are defined as follows:

**Labor claims:** payments to individuals in return for services rendered. These include all wages, salaries and supplements paid by corporate profits, earnings on the investment agricultural enterprises and governments. Also included are imputed labor payments to the self-employed. Not included are government and business transfer payments—such as unemployment insurance payments, or cancellations of bad debts—which are income to the recipient, but are not paid in return for services performed. From this total are deducted the personal income taxes falling on labor incomes.

**Property claims:** payments to individuals and businesses (corporate and unincorporated) in return for the use of existing tangible and liquid assets. These include corporate profits, earnings on the investment of unincorporated enterprises, interest payments to individuals and rental income of individuals. From this total are deducted the personal and corporate taxes falling on property incomes.

**Tax claims:** include all direct taxes on the incomes of individuals and corporations, and all indirect taxes, of Federal, State and local governments. In general, taxes which do not arise as a result of current production and trade—capital gains taxes, estate taxes, gift taxes—are not included.

In general, the procedure for allocation of claims against total national output took the form of a series of adjustments to the statistics of the Department of Commerce on national income by distributive shares.

(a) The national income account treats the income of unincorporated business and farm enterprises as a distinct classification of income; in the Conference Board report, the wage, property, and tax components of this income are identified.

(b) The national income total is reported before deduction of all direct taxes. While the corporate tax burden is shown as a separate component, there is no identification of the personal tax burden in the national income figures. The Conference Board study segregates the tax portion of corporate incomes, and extracts personal taxes from labor and property claims.

(c) The national income account excludes two money flows which are claims against the national product—namely, capital consumption allowances and indirect business taxes. The Conference Board study includes indirect business taxes as tax claims, and segregates the labor, property, and tax claims embedded in capital consumption allowances.

The study finds that in 1954 total claims against gross national product were divided as follows: labor claims, 63.1 percent; property claims, 12.7 percent; and tax claims, 24.2 percent. The distribution of all private claims—that is, all claims excluding tax

claims—was as follows: labor claims, 83.2 percent; and property claims, 16.8 percent.

With respect to allocations of claims for individual commodities, the procedure was to identify the margins, after materials cost, which are available for distribution to labor, to the owners of the capital employed, and to government in the form of direct and indirect taxes. These distributions of claims for each margin were then summed to arrive at the distribution of total claims.

The Board study deals with the final sale value of each commodity—that is, the retail value—in all cases except steel bars, where the mill price was used. The study calculates the distribution of claims for each commodity as among labor, property, and tax claims; it also calculates the distribution of all private claims—that is, all claims excluding tax claims. Only the latter set of distributions is reproduced here.

#### ECONOMETRIC SPECIALISTS, INC.—THE RELATIVE SIZE OF LABOR CLAIMS, PROPERTY CLAIMS, AND TAX CLAIMS, NATIONALLY AND IN SELECTED COMMODITIES

##### EXPLANATION OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the relative importance of labor cost, direct and indirect, in the value of production of six representative industries: carbon steel, machinery, motor vehicles, paper, textiles, and residential housing.

The proportion of direct labor cost in the value of production is relatively easy of identification and is often included in the annual reports of leading companies. However, what was sought in this inquiry was the full labor content of a typical motor vehicle, a typical machine, a typical residential dwelling, and so on. By labor cost is meant the payment both of wages and salaries as well as social security, pensions, and other wage benefits.

The inquiry was directed mainly to the other major cost elements in production, to find the labor content in each. Thus, each industry consumes a certain amount of raw materials, fuels, semifinished goods and various kinds of services in the manufacture of its product. In addition, each industry lays aside sums for depreciation to pay for the capital consumed in the production process. Moreover, each industry must pay taxes to local, State, and Federal Governments. Each of these cost elements in the value of the finished product have been examined for their labor content. In these instances the labor content is indirect, but exists nonetheless.

The study was therefore divided into four stages, of which the second required the largest amount of analysis.

1. The first phase was concerned with ascertaining the direct labor cost in each of the six industries.

2. The second and major phase was directed to tracing the labor component of the materials used in producing the six products being investigated back to the earliest supplying stage; i.e., the manufacture of fuels and power for use in the production process. Here were estimated the labor components of all materials used in production of each of these products.

3. The third phase dealt with the estimated labor component of depreciation in each of the six industries. In addition, it established estimates of the labor component of indirect depreciation considered as part of the cost of materials purchased by each of the six industries.

4. The fourth phase made estimates of the labor component of all taxes paid to Federal, State, and local governments. This consisted in determining the relative portion of these taxes distributed as wages and salaries to Government workers, and in estimated

indirect labor component of goods and services purchased by these three levels of government.

The final answer for each of the six products thus includes (1) an allocation of some part of the cost of materials for the production of motor vehicles, machinery, etc., the indirect labor; (2) the further allocation of some part of depreciation cost—which in effect is payment for past purchases of goods and services having a labor component—to indirect labor; and (3) the allocation of some part of taxes paid by each industry to indirect labor.

#### Steel industry's rate of return on sales

Year	Return on sales	Year	Return on sales
	Percent		Percent
1940.....	8.1	1949.....	7.2
1941.....	6.0	1950.....	8.1
1942.....	3.3	1951.....	5.8
1943.....	2.8	1952.....	5.0
1944.....	2.7	1953.....	5.6
1945.....	3.1	1954.....	6.1
1946.....	5.5	1955.....	7.9
1947.....	6.2	1956.....	7.3
1948.....	6.7	1957.....	7.3

Source: Annual Statistical Reports, American Iron and Steel Institute.

#### DECENTRALIZATION PROGRAM—WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order just granted to me be vacated, and that I have permission to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that on April 8 I called attention of the Members of the House to information I had received regarding the intention of the USAF to move management of various rocket programs from WPAFB, near Dayton, Ohio, to Edwards Air Force Base in California, and requested appropriate committees of the House to make a proper inquiry into this matter.

Permit me to again refer to my comments on April 8, Mr. Speaker, when I specifically pointed out that "I have no selfish motives in opposing such a move but do so only in the interest of national defense."

Mr. Speaker, when I was home during the Easter recess of the Congress, I was deeply impressed by the widespread concern of people generally relative to the adequacy and needs of our defense forces to provide for our national safety and welfare. I was just as deeply impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the complete confidence expressed by thoughtful people throughout the Third District of Ohio in the understanding, knowledge, and expertness of President Eisenhower in all such matters. These people are perfectly willing to accept the President's judgment as to the kind, size, extent, and direction of our defense forces.

Thinking people also realize, Mr. Speaker, that with the ever-changing complexity of technological improvements in weapons and weapon systems costs are inevitably higher. They have expressed their willingness, Mr. Speaker, to bear these high defense costs, but they also insist, and rightly so, I feel, that

every effort must be made to secure the greatest possible efficiency in the expenditure of defense funds and that waste be reduced wherever it can be found.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the entire basis for my calling attention to the proposed move of the management of the rocket programs from Wright Air Development Command located at WPAFB to Edwards Air Force Base. I brought my remarks to the attention of the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman, House Committee on Armed Services. Chairman VINSON, in accordance with his deep personal interest in all such matters, and in accordance with his always complete readiness to cooperate with all other Members of the House in all proper matters, gave this question his immediate attention and wrote to me under date of April 11. Chairman VINSON's letter said, in part:

I am today making inquiry of the Air Force concerning this matter, requesting that a full explanation be made to me. As soon as I have received the report I will again contact you.

Mr. Speaker, under date of April 16, 1959, Jack Jones, staff writer for the Dayton Daily News, wrote a very revealing story which was published in the Dayton Daily News of that date. Under unanimous consent, I include this story as written by Mr. Jones as a part of these remarks:

#### ROCKET UNIT TO TAKE OFF

Employees in the rocket division of Wright Air Development Center's propulsion laboratory have been notified that their jobs are being transferred away from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, it was learned today. Meanwhile WADC officials said they had received no official word on the status of the reported move.

WADC officials less than 2 weeks ago had denied that there were any plans for moving the rocket research group from the base here. Then a week ago, they admitted that plans were in the talking stage at Air Research and Development Command Headquarters at Andrews AFB, Md. It is expected that the unit will be transferred to Edwards AFB, Calif. Reports are that some 200 of the laboratory's 700 employees may be affected.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Jack Jones for many years and know him to be a very able reporter and one who bases his stories on the facts as he is able to learn them.

I am shocked and disturbed by the contents of this story, Mr. Speaker, because of the apparent unconcern of top-side brass for either efficiency or costs.

These rocket programs, Mr. Speaker, I am told by knowledgeable people, are of tremendous importance in the overall interest of our national security. Any interruption in their management and production, it appears, could cause serious concern. Also the uprooting of highly trained scientific personnel could easily cause these people to seek other employment where their residence would not be so likely to be changed for some whim. Not only is this unnecessary delay and interruption of such programs of vital concern, but increased costs will most surely result. This has happened, Mr. Speaker, according to the best information I have been able to obtain, on numerous programs where similar changes have been ordered. Thus it seems to me,

Mr. Speaker, that those in positions of responsibility in the Department of Defense should be required to completely justify their actions before the appropriate committees of the Congress, including the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations before any such contemplated changes are consummated. All of us, Mr. Speaker, are being constantly urged by well informed citizens to reduce the cost of our Federal Government where such savings can be made without adversely affecting our national safety and essential services. This cannot be done, Mr. Speaker, if the Congress constantly yields to the apparently insatiable demands of an always expanding Federal bureaucracy.

It is my firm conviction, Mr. Speaker, that each and every one of us must make every effort to insist upon efficiency and economy in each and every operation of our Federal Government. This is important not only in the interest of our national safety and security during these times of worldwide tensions, but it is also important to the future economic stability of our Nation.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that those in charge of our military programs as well as those in charge of our civilian service programs which are almost without number, will somehow achieve an awareness of their responsibilities and will consider the welfare of our entire Nation above any personal desire for position or power. We, as Members of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, owe our most sincere, continuing and earnest efforts, not only to our constituents and the entire Nation, but to the generations yet unborn to the end that this Nation will continue to be the greatest place in the world in which to live and a Nation where the freedoms that have been won at such high cost will continue through time and future. It is also my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the incident to which these remarks are addressed along with any future similar ideas will be given the most thorough and proper consideration by the appropriate committees, Members of the Congress, and all officials in positions of Federal responsibility.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for tomorrow may be transferred to Tuesday, April 28.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### THE LATE ANTHONY P. DEMMA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, and particularly its press gallery, lost a most valuable public servant during the past year.

Anthony P. Demma, a gentleman of deep faiths, known to many of us as "Tony," died last October 3 after a brief and unexpected illness. Had he lived, he would have been 61 years old today.

Tony Demma had been assistant superintendent of the press gallery since 1934. He had been a fixture in the gallery since 1912 and had acquired a circle of friends of whom anyone could be proud. He was plain "Tony" to everyone who knew him, including Presidents Taft, Wilson, Hoover, Harding, Coolidge, Roosevelt, and Truman. He attended to the professional and personal needs of our friends in the press gallery with zeal and efficiency.

Tony Demma was only 10 years old when he got the smell of printer's ink as a copy boy for the old Washington Times. Subsequently he worked for the United Press, the Baltimore Sun, and Western Union, acquiring a firsthand knowledge of the newspaper profession. His "firsts" on the news wires included Woodrow Wilson's "war message" in April 1917, and the drawing of the first draft number by Secretary of War Newton D. Baker in World War I.

He was an ardent sportsman, his first love being baseball. He played with and managed the press gallery ball teams in their annual games with the congressional teams.

We who knew him miss Tony and his cheerful presence. Not often does a man of such character, such energy and such devotion to duty come along.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

#### CENTENNIAL OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND STATE UNIVERSITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4012) to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for related purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a member of the committee several questions concerning proposed amendments. May we have the proposed amendments discussed in connection with the intention, if the bill is considered and the amendments offered?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments cover a limit on the appropriations which may not be exceeded. They will include the traveling and other expenses of this Commission as far as the appropriation is concerned.

Mr. FORD. In other words, there will be a total ceiling available or authorized for this ceremony of \$200,000?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORD. Can there be a clear understanding with the proponents of this legislation that the \$200,000 is to be the total amount, with no second request thereafter?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. May we understand also that if this legislation is approved with the amendments that all expenses incurred will be handled out of the \$200,000, and I refer to all Federal expenses, of course.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes. All such expenses would be paid out of these funds.

Mr. FORD. There would be no burden placed on the individual departments that do cooperate?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. No, except to this extent, and I read from a letter written by the Department of Agriculture:

In view of the widespread interest in and significance of the centennial celebrations throughout the country, it is anticipated that various entities will participate in the celebrations, including civic bodies, interested farm and educational organizations, and individuals, as well as State and Federal governmental agencies.

To that extent the Department of Agriculture, for example, will participate in the project, and it will do so through the use of its regular resources and facilities and as a part of its functional responsibilities.

Mr. FORD. These amendments will be offered if the bill is considered?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought this was a \$100,000 appropriation. Is it a \$200,000 appropriation?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. It is \$200,000.

Mr. FORD. It is a \$200,000 authorization.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. It is an authorization, and that is the top limit.

Mr. GROSS. Then is it broken down into \$100,000 for one purpose and \$100,000 for another purpose? What is the story?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. No.

Mr. GROSS. It is a total authorization of \$200,000?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas May 15, 1962, marks the centennial of legislation establishing the United States Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas July 2, 1962, marks the centennial of legislation providing for the establishment of the national system of land-grant colleges and State universities; and

Whereas American agriculture is basic to our free economy, and

Whereas the research, service, and educational work of the United States Department of Agriculture has over the years resulted in great benefits to the American people through increased efficiency in the production, utilization, and marketing of agricul-

ture products essential to the health and welfare of our people and through the promotion of a sound and prosperous agriculture and rural life indispensable to the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity; and

Whereas the national system of land-grant colleges and universities, has fully justified the hope of its founders and now contributes annually more than half the Nation's trained scientists and nearly half the Regular and Reserve officers for its defense forces, and enrolls approximately one-fifth of all students in degree-granting colleges of the Nation; and

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges and State universities have historically maintained, and currently maintain, close cooperative relationships; and

Whereas it is appropriate that there be national recognition of and participation in the celebrations of the centennial of these two historic Acts of Congress jointly and separately by the Department of Agriculture and the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities: Therefore

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is deemed fitting and proper to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the land-grant college system by the first Morrill Act, approved July 2, 1862, granting public lands to the States and Territories in support of colleges to emphasize branches of learning relating to agriculture and mechanical arts including other scientific and classical studies and military tactics, and the one hundredth anniversary of the Act of May 15, 1862, establishing the United States Department of Agriculture, and in addition to celebrate jointly such anniversaries of these events.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be established a commission to be known as the "Commission for the Commemoration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Enactment of Legislation for the Establishment of the Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities and for the Founding of the United States Department of Agriculture" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of the following:

The President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the president of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, as honorary members.

Four Senators to be designated by the President of the Senate, and four Representatives to be designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, appropriate representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.

Such other persons as may be designated by the President of the United States after consideration of such recommendation as may be made by the United States Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare; the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities; the United States Conference of Governors; the Association of State Commissioners, Directors, and Secretaries of Agriculture; the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions; farm organizations; and other interested organizations.

The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission shall be designated by the President. The Commission shall take office as of July 1, 1959.

Sec. 3. There shall be an Executive Committee for the Commission to carry out the

functions of the Commission under its general direction. The Executive Committee shall be composed of the following from among the members of the Commission: two Senators designated by the President of the Senate, two Representatives designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and eleven persons designated by the President of the United States, as follows: one representative of the United States Department of Agriculture, one representative of the Department of Defense, one representative of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, one representative of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, one representative of the Association of State Commissioners, Directors, and Secretaries of Agriculture, one representative of the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, and five others.

Sec. 4. It shall be the function of the Commission to coordinate and approve suitable plans for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the enactment of the Land-Grant College Act, the establishment of the United States Department of Agriculture, and, in addition, the joint observance of such anniversaries of these events. The Commission shall give due consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to it, and shall, to the extent feasible, coordinate its plans with related plans of States and local and civic bodies.

Sec. 5. It is the desire of the Congress that the Commission shall do all things fitting and proper to give support and coordination to the commemoration activities anticipated by this Act, including cooperation with States, local and civic bodies, and interested organizations in appropriate local celebrations, and participation in regional and national celebrations.

Sec. 6. The Commission in carrying out the purposes of this Act is authorized to—

- (a) accept donations of money and property;
- (b) employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary;
- (c) accept and utilize services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and pay such personnel when engaged in the work of the Commission necessary travel and subsistence expenses, or in the alternate, transportation and not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence;
- (d) cooperate with public or private organizations, or individuals;
- (e) accept from Federal agencies and the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities their services and assistance with or without reimbursement to them;
- (f) provide Federal agencies and the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities with assistance through grants or otherwise in relation to their planned activities; and
- (g) without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property, make contracts and exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 7. Appropriate bodies of the States and the legislatures of such States are hereby encouraged to make provision for and carry out such programs within such States as will implement the commemoration activities anticipated by this Act, and also to participate in regional and national celebrations. States are likewise urged and requested to furnish to the Commission any plans or proposals they may have in connection with the commemoration of the founding of the land-grant colleges or the United States Department of Agriculture, and to cooperate with the Commission in carrying out national and regional celebrations.

Sec. 8. Members of the Commission and of the Executive Committee shall serve without compensation but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission or Executive Committee or in the alternate they may receive their transportation and not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence. Service as a member of the Commission or Executive Committee shall in no way interfere with payment of the regular compensation of any officer of the United States, and applicable appropriations pursuant to which such officers are employed shall be available for travel and other expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission or Executive Committee.

Sec. 9. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or Executive Committee or employment of an individual by the Commission in a technical or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

Sec. 10. The Commission shall make a final report to the Congress on or before June 30, 1963, and make such interim reports as it may deem proper.

Sec. 11. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prepare plans for the appropriate commemorative celebration of the founding of the United States Department of Agriculture and to join in celebrating the centenary of the founding of the land-grant colleges and State universities. The Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized and directed to prepare plans for cooperation with the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. Such plans shall be submitted to the Commission for approval and coordination with other plans. Within the scope of any plans approved by the Commission, and with its advice and consultation, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized and directed to carry out such plans, in cooperation, to the extent feasible, with appropriate bodies of the States.

All agencies of the Federal Government are authorized to participate in celebrations pursuant to this Act. For the purposes of this section Federal agencies are authorized to utilize funds and authorities otherwise available to them. The Secretary of Agriculture may also utilize applicable authorities made available to the Commission under section 6 hereof.

Sec. 12. The American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and States Universities and the individual member institutions are encouraged to prepare and submit to the Commission plans for commemoration celebrations as contemplated by this Act. Member institutions receiving benefits under the Second Morrill Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 321-328), section 22 of the Bankhead-Jones Act (7 U.S.C. 329), the Smith-Lever Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 341-348), or the Hatch Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 361a-361i), are authorized to utilize such funds in preparing such plans and in carrying out plans approved by the Commission.

Sec. 13. Any revenue accruing to the Commission from the carrying out of this Act may be merged with appropriations made to the Commission for use in covering the costs arising hereunder. Any unexpended balances of funds upon the termination of the Commission shall revert to the general funds of the Treasury. All property of the Commission remaining shall be deemed surplus property.

Sec. 14. For the purposes of the Act the word "State" includes Territories, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Sec. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, to be available until expended.

Sec. 16. Except as prescribed in section 2 hereof, the authorizations of this Act shall become effective immediately, and shall terminate June 30, 1963.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer some committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 24, after the word "States" strike out "and applicable appropriations pursuant to which such officers are employed shall be available for travel and other expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission or Executive Committee".

Page 10, line 10, following the word "sums," insert "not to exceed \$200,000".

Page 10, line 10, strike out the words "provisions of this Act" and insert "purposes and functions of the Commission and Executive Committee".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the letter of the Department of Agriculture previously referred to, dated April 14, 1959.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, April 14, 1959.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: On January 29, 1959, this Department transmitted to the Congress proposed legislation for centennial celebrations of the establishment of this Department and the land-grant colleges and State universities. The proposal was introduced as H.R. 4012 and reported favorably by your committee.

In view of questions recently raised on the floor of the House during consideration of the Consent Calendar, we should like to make clear that the \$200,000 authorization would be for the expenses of the Commission and would not include expenses of the cooperating agencies.

In view of the widespread interest in and significance of the centennial celebrations throughout the country, it is anticipated that various entities will participate in the celebrations, including civic bodies, interested farm and educational organizations, and individuals, as well as State and Federal governmental agencies. To the extent that the Department of Agriculture, for example, will participate in the project, it will do so through the use of its regular resources and facilities and as a part of its functional responsibilities.

The work of the Commission will be to coordinate the efforts of the cooperating entities and to arrange for proper and well-balanced participation by the groups involved. We believe the Commission will make the project more meaningful, more efficient, and more economical.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON,  
Assistant Secretary.



## PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the bills on the Private Calendar will be called.

## MRS ELBA HAVERSTICK CASH

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H.R. 1434, for the relief of Mrs. Elba Haverstick Cash.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

## THOMAS A. HOWE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1601) for the relief of Thomas A. Howe.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

## DR. GORDON D. HOOPLE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3825) for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doctor Gordon D. Hoople, Syracuse, New York, the sum of \$1,774; to Doctor David W. Brewer, Syracuse, New York, the sum of \$20; and to the estate of the late Doctor Irl H. Blaisdell, Syracuse, New York, the sum of \$170. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of Doctor Gordon D. Hoople, Doctor David W. Brewer, and the late Doctor Irl H. Blaisdell against the United States for payment of the unpaid accounts for medical treatment and services rendered veterans from 1946 through 1952: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## JOSE SANTIAGO SAVEDRA CALZA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3817) for the relief of Jose Santiago Savedra Calza.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## NORTH COUNTIES HYDRO-ELECTRIC CO.

The Clerk called House Resolution 189, providing for sending the bill (H.R. 5093) for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co. and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 189 be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## JOHN F. CARMODY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2100) for the relief of John F. Carmody.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John F. Carmody, of Moberly, Missouri, the sum of \$1,020. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said John F. Carmody arising out of a contract with the Secretary of Agriculture for cost-sharing under subtitle B (conservation reserve program) of the Soil Bank Act with respect to a dam constructed in 1957 on a farm operated by the said John F. Carmody in Randolph County, Missouri: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,020" and insert "\$595."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 322 for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jimmy Ines, Claudio Diaz Torres, and Emily Elkas Batrie shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees: *Provided,* That the admission of the said Claudio Diaz Torres shall be under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Sur-

geon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided further,* That, unless the said Claudio Diaz Torres is entitled to care under chapter 55, title 10, United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eva Bromberger, Mrs. Chi-Wen Liu (nee Hsu Dzon-Tsung), Mrs. Soledad C. Upton, Wilhelmina C. Brady, Mary Ray, Eduardo Mausisa, Francisca Mortell Grepo, Ella Mathez, Karl Johan Sell, and Juana Domenech shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees: *Provided,* That the admission of the said Francisca Mortell Grepo and the said Juana Domenech shall be under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided further,* That, unless the said Francisca Mortell Grepo and the said Juana Domenech are entitled to care under chapter 55, title 10, United States Code, suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this Act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds which may have issued in the cases of Moises Garza Barriga, Androula G. Kyriacou, and Francisco Gomez-Olvera; *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act in the case of Androula G. Kyriacou. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Moises Garza Barriga, Androula G. Kyriacou, and Francisco Gomez-Olvera shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roderick Joseph Grant, also known as Robert Grant shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 1, 1927, upon payment of the required visa fee.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lum Sum Git, also known as George Git Lum, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 1, 1932, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 17, after the name "Kyriacou", change the period to a colon and add the following proviso: "*Provided further,* That, unless Francisco Gomez-Olvera is entitled to care under chapter 55, title 10, United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by

section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the said Francisco Gomez-Olivera may be permitted to remain in the United States under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

On page 4, after line 7, insert the following: "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FACILITATING ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 323) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Manda Wilkinson, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Ray L. Wilkinson, citizens of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

Sec. 2. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Veresan shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Mr. Gus Kosta Veresan, a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Alfredo A. Guinitaran, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Lope Guinitaran, citizens of the United States: *Provided, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

Sec. 4. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Adela A. Nones shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Benito O. Nones, a citizen of the United States. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the said Adela A. Nones may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided, That unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55, title 10, United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: Provided further, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of*

State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 5. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carmela DeBono shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Charles DeBono, a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 6. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lee Kuhn Wui shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

Sec. 7. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lambrini Georgina Mellias, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. George P. Mellias, citizens of the United States: *Provided, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

Sec. 8. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josefina Formalejo shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Bernardino P. Formalejo, a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 9. For the purposes of sections 203(a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giovanni Moschella shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Pietro Moschella, a lawfully resident alien of the United States: *Provided, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

Sec. 10. For the purposes of section 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ilda Mato Martinez shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mr. and Mrs. George Mato Martinez, citizens of the United States: *Provided, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

Sec. 11. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Mary Stathocopoulos and Evangelia Stathocopoulos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mrs. Eva Poulos, a citizen of the United States: *Provided, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

Sec. 12. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chang Wah Cheung shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Chang Ting Yen, a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 13. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sheung Jeung shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Jeung Gim, a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 14. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Stjepan Sternberger (Srecko Ljubicic) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Sternberger.

Sec. 15. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yoko Kawamura shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mr. and Mrs. Donat Beland, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 16. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Giorgia Rotolo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Sinatra, citizens of the United States: *Provided, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not by virtue of such*

parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Sec. 17. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Makoto Yabusaki shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, line 25, strike out the name "Maria Giorgia Rotolo," and substitute the name "Maria Giorgia Rotolo Sinatra."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 324) to waive certain provisions of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Viktors Neimanis may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: Provided, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55, title 10, United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alan Doctors and George Maurice De Neef may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act.

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Loo Shee Yee, also known as Low Shee, may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55, title 10, United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

Sec. 4. The exemptions provided for in this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

After the enacting clause strike out section 1 of the joint resolution beginning on page 1, line 3, through line 4 on page 2.



On page 2, line 5, strike out "Sec. 2. Notwithstanding" and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding".

On page 2, line 11, strike out "Sec. 3." and substitute "Sec. 2.".

On page 3, line 1, strike out "Sec. 4." and substitute "Sec. 3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 95 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 451 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred and thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.*

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Ohio will explain to the House that these resolutions we are about to consider were unanimously approved both by the Subcommittee on Printing and by the full Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HAYS. That is true. There was no disagreement on any of the resolutions which we are about to call up.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### "THE NEXT TEN YEARS IN SPACE, 1959-1969"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 157 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the staff report entitled "The Next Ten Years in Space, 1959-1969" (heretofore printed as a committee print for the use of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the House of Representatives), and there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives fifteen thousand additional copies of such House document.*

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "fifteen" and insert "ten".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### "COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES — WHAT IT IS — WHAT IT DOES"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That the publication entitled "Committee on Un-American Activities—What It Is—What It Does" prepared by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, be printed as a House document; and that there be printed forty thousand additional copies of this document for the use of said committee.*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### "PATTERNS OF COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That the publication entitled "Patterns of Communist Espionage", prepared by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, be printed as a House document; and that there be printed ten thousand additional copies of this document for the use of said committee.*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### "ORGANIZED COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES (REVISED)"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 170 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities six thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 1724, Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, entitled "Organized Communism in the United States (Revised)."*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Ohio for the continued interest which he has displayed in the very difficult task that the Committee on Un-American Activities has in supplying the

information that is sought from all sources. The gentleman has been most helpful.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is it that is proposed to be printed here? Can we not have some explanation?

Mr. HAYS. This particular resolution, House Resolution 170, authorizes the printing of 6,000 copies of House Report No. 1724 of the 85th Congress entitled "Organized Communism in the United States (Revised)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### U.S. CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 177 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That there shall be printed two thousand five hundred copies of the publication entitled "United States Capitol Page School," of which one thousand five hundred shall be for the use of the Doorkeeper of the House, and one thousand for the use of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.*

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 1, strike out "two thousand five hundred" and insert "four thousand."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "one thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say that the reason for this committee amendment increasing the number was because we found that by doing this we could avoid going back to the House in about a year and a half or so to request additional copies. By doing it this way we can save probably \$500 by printing a sufficient number now instead of doing it every year and a half.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### "PRICE DISCRIMINATION IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 194 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business, five thousand additional copies of the report entitled, "Price Discrimination in the Distribution of Dairy Products", House Report Numbered 2713, Eighty-fifth Congress,*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What is this?

Mr. HAYS. This report is one from the Committee on Small Business entitled "Price Discrimination in Distribution of Dairy Products."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ENTITLED "U.S. FOREIGN AID, ITS PURPOSES," ETC.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 201 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the report prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, entitled "United States Foreign Aid, Its Purposes, Scope, Administration, and Related Information", dated February 27, 1959, be printed as a House document; and that there be printed three thousand additional copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "three" and insert "ten".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is this "for" or "agin" foreign aid—this document?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the committee thrashed this matter out pretty conclusively and we considered it to be a very objective document. I would say from my own observation that if it leans in either direction; it probably leans slightly against it, although I think it is very important. The reason I am for it is because it has in it a supply of information that I have never seen or been able to get gathered together in any one place before, relating to the amounts that we have contributed to various countries over the years and the various types of foreign aid.

Mr. GROSS. This is not that document that was printed last year with questions and self-serving answers by the Department of State?

Mr. HAYS. No; this was printed at the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] and a group of his colleagues, to give them information which would guide them in their consideration of foreign aid legislation. They thought it was worthwhile and asked to have it printed. The committee evaluated it and thought it would be valuable to the membership.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 228 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities ten thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 187, current session, entitled "Annual Report for the Year 1958".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 232 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, four thousand additional copies of the hearings entitled "Mineral Treatment Processes for Percentage Depletion Purposes".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PRESENTATION OF OFFICIAL FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES BEARING 49 STARS

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 19.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to present to the Senators and Representative in Congress from the State of Alaska the official flag of the United States bearing forty-nine stars which is first flown over the west front of the United States Capitol, for presentation by such Senators and Representatives to the Governor of Alaska.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### HON. CHRISTIAN HERTER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the news of the resignation of Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, saddened me, as I know it did all of us. When I first heard the announcement, immediately after my return from Geneva, where I had the honor to serve as a member of the 10th meeting of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, I also felt a sense of trepidation concerning the future course and conduct of our foreign policy. That has been allayed by the announcement of the appointment of Christian Herter as Mr. Dulles' successor.

In years past we have grown accustomed to the continuous vaporings of the chorus of Dulles detractors—both domestic and foreign. I do not know what actuated them or caused them to persist in their attempts to undermine our Secretary of State and the conduct of our foreign policy. But how their tune has changed now that they know that almighty providence has caused the target of their attacks to lay down his heavy burden. Not in my memory, Mr. Speaker, do I recall such a complete about-face on the part of the newspaper and radio pundits—both here and abroad—in so short a time in their evaluation of a man and the policies he espoused.

Perhaps we should be charitable and compare these critics to the resentful child who chafed under the benign discipline of a devoted parent and then awoke to the frightening realization that the source of his irritation had been removed by the intervention of providence and that he now was on his own in a cruel and hostile world.

One of the charges most frequently leveled at Secretary Dulles by his detractors was that he was not popular abroad. I say again, Mr. Speaker, as I said some time ago in this Chamber, that when we evaluate the competence of a Secretary of State in proportion to his popularity abroad we will indeed be setting up the most dangerous, the most unrealistic of criteria. Paraphrasing Desdemona, I say now, as I said then, of Mr. Dulles: "I love him for the enemies he has made."

John Foster Dulles is a man of prodigious courage and determination who can face unflinchingly physical suffering. However, the mental torment of being unable to see through his policies or to participate in the crucial negotiations immediately ahead and his concern for the security and welfare of our Nation in the parlous times which face us must be for him a heavy burden indeed.

Few men in the history of our Nation have been such consummate practitioners of the art of diplomacy as Secretary Dulles. Few, if indeed any, have, through resolute determination, prophetic foresight, penetrating analysis and rigid adherence to the natural law been able to follow so unswervingly a



predetermined course or to achieve so large a measure of their objective.

There are international politicians—I would not, Mr. Speaker, call them statesmen—who contend that in the relations between powers there is no morality; that the only law is self-interest, and that whatever any government, whether dictatorship or democracy, determines is in its own self-interest is indeed moral. Such a course of action, predicated on subjective norms and self-interest, must lead inevitably to a clash of nations, which may vary in degree from a cold war to a nuclear holocaust. Repeatedly in his public utterances Secretary Dulles proclaimed as the only true norm for the conduct of nations the rule of law; the objective, immutable norm of the moral law of man predicated upon the natural law of God. We shall see no true peace on earth until nations accept and abide by this principle. If he rendered no other single service to the comity of international relations, this contribution alone would entitle John Foster Dulles to be remembered as long as nations exist.

I feel a deep personal sadness at Secretary Dulles' misfortune as any of us would feel for a friend whom we greatly admire. I pray God that He may spare to us this great, this good and courageous, this deeply religious man for many years to come. His advice and counsel can be invaluable to any President or any administration. I also hope, Mr. Speaker, that he may be spared to write his memoirs, to fill the gaps of history and to pass on to future generations of Americans his great wisdom and knowledge concerning the conduct of foreign affairs and the practice of the art of diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that those of our colleagues who had the pleasure of serving in this body with Christian Herter share my pleasure and satisfaction in knowing that he has been appointed to the great office of Secretary of State of the United States at this most crucial moment.

Mr. Herter has proved himself in many fields. Since his early youth he has had a keen and continuing interest in foreign affairs. He knows and is liked by people, as is evidenced by the fact that he served in the 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st, and 82d Congresses. Subsequently he was chosen by the people of Massachusetts as the chief executive of that great Commonwealth. He is forceful; he is a leader and he can project his personality and his thoughts. But also he is kind, courteous, accommodating and respectful of the opinions of others. He can and will represent us well at the international conference tables. His background, experience and achievements preeminently qualify him for the great responsibilities which now face him.

It is with pleasure that I remember my service on the Select Committee on Foreign Aid of the 80th Congress, on which I served with Governor Herter. In later years that group came to be popularly known as the Herter Committee. I like to believe that that group was, in a

measure, instrumental in having the Congress adopt the first and succeeding Marshall plans, the Truman doctrine and other measures which stopped the onward rush of communism in Europe and restored to a position of economic independence the free countries of the European Continent. I have seen with my own eyes, year by year, the results of those programs in Europe and I am keenly aware of the contribution which they have made to NATO and to the defense of the West. I also like to believe that we can, to a degree, share with President Truman and his great Secretary of State, General Marshall, the credit for the vision which inspired these programs. Certainly, Christian Herter was one of the principal architects of this edifice of defense. I salute him for his leadership and his foresight.

Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the remarks of some of the distinguished leaders of my party in the other body, when the appointment of Christian Herter as Secretary of State first was thought likely. They commended his qualifications for this high office and offered nonpartisan support. I think that we, too, believe that partisan politics should stop at the water's edge. I hope that I speak for my colleagues in promising Chris Herter the same nonpartisan support which was accorded his predecessor. I firmly believe that he will have the trust, the support and the prayers of all patriotic Americans as he now assumes the heavy burdens so recently and so tragically relinquished by Secretary Dulles and moves forward to the difficult days ahead. I wish him success in all he undertakes.

#### HELPING DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF AN UNEMPLOYED FATHER

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an amendment to the Social Security Act which would broaden the Federal grant-in-aid program to provide assistance to needy children when the father is unemployed.

The amendment takes the form of a very simple change in section 406(a) of the Social Security Act. By adding the word "unemployment" in this section, State welfare agencies would be able to modify their existing State aid to dependent children programs to extend aid to families with children when the father was unemployed.

At the present time, Federal funds are available to the States under the aid to dependent children program only when a child is needy due to the "death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity" of a parent—section 406(a) of the Social Security Act. As a result, the law places a premium on desertion. If, when a father is

unemployed, and he needs public assistance, he cannot receive it in some localities—unless he deserts his family. When he deserts, his family can become eligible for Aid to Dependent Children.

Nobody knows, of course, how many such forced desertions occur, because when the mother applies for aid to dependent children the father has already left the family and it is then impossible to find out what motivated his action. But we can be reasonably certain that the Federal law, in its present form, puts pressure on the father to desert if he wishes to see his children and wife fed and sheltered. It necessitates that the father face the dilemma—stay with his family and perhaps all starve—or desert and give them a meager assistance until he can find a job elsewhere and come back for them or bring them to his new location.

Whatever may be the cost, I do not believe it is sound public policy for our Federal legislation to encourage, accept, or condone desertion. Consequently, I shall press for favorable action for my amendment and I earnestly solicit the support of members of the Committee on Ways and Means for my amendment.

Every State in the Union has an aid to dependent children program which is receiving Federal grants-in-aid under title IV of the Social Security Act. In January 1959 the average monthly payment per recipient was only \$28.35—less than a dollar per day. Each State is free to decide the amount to be paid to the recipients and the standards to be set. But the Federal law determines the scope of coverage. This is something we can and must correct in the Federal law.

Numerous organizations have urged the Congress to broaden the coverage of the Aid to Dependent Children program. Among those advocating such a change are the American Public Welfare Association, the National Association of Social Workers, the AFL-CIO, the American Parents' Committee, and other organizations interested in children and families.

I particularly wish to cite two goals stated by the American Public Welfare Association in its "Federal Legislative Objectives—1959." These seem to me to be a sound basis for evaluating and supporting my amendment. Here is what the APWA says:

Public welfare programs should provide effective services to all who require them including financial assistance and preventive, protective, and rehabilitative services, and these services should be available to all persons without regard to residence, settlement, or citizenship requirements;

Democracy has a special obligation to assure to all the Nation's children full and equitable opportunity for family life, healthy growth, and maximum utilization of their potentialities.

Our present Aid to Dependent Children program does not accord with these objectives. We should not be content to allow the situation to remain the way it is. We need a change in the scope of the program.

As a member of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the

Committee on Government Operations, I had the opportunity to study State programs of public assistance. I came to the conclusion, from our studies, that both our unemployment insurance and public assistance programs need strengthening. The experience during the recession confirms this.

The amendment I have introduced would help the States to be in a better position to meet unemployment when it occurs. But even more so, it would be another step in the direction of helping "to maintain and strengthen family life." This objective was written into the Aid to Dependent Children provisions of the Social Security Act by Congress in 1956 in sections 401, 402(a)(11) and 403(a)(2). My amendment will help carry out this objective by keeping families together and helping them to get back on their feet when unemployment is a cause of need.

Mr. President, I believe it would be desirable to broaden the Aid to Dependent Children program so that any needy child could be given assistance in his own home. As a step in this direction, we should broaden the program now to include unemployment as an eligibility condition. We should give the States the opportunity to do so now while the lessons of the recession are still fresh in our mind.

From information received from State welfare directors, I believe that many States could take advantage of my amendment immediately without any further State legislation. Other States are eager and willing to do so as soon as the Federal law is changed.

Congress should take prompt action on this important matter.

#### WELFARE AND RECREATION AGENCIES SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the disposal of surplus property to medical institutions, health centers, schools, colleges, and related organizations has proven of enormous benefit to institutions in South Dakota as well as throughout the country. Good use has been made of this property, especially by our schools and colleges. During the past year, about 80 percent of all surplus personal property was distributed to schools, about 10 percent to hospital and health facilities, and 10 percent for civil defense purposes.

The present Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949 should be amended, however, to include worthy welfare and recreational agencies. These agencies which deal specifically with our aged, our young people, and our needy are doing a tremendous job—generally with very limited funds. They need this property and can put it to good use in the building of a stronger America.

The proposed bill would broaden eligibility to include agencies such as the Salvation Army, YMCA, YWCA, Travelers Aid, and other similar organizations. The bill insures that only tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare or recreational agencies would be eligible for this property. A tax-exempt voluntary agency would have to have a license from a State standard-setting agency, or receive funds through a State or local community fund, or be affiliated with or a part of a national standard-setting organization.

The bill has grown out of recommendations drawn up by a national welfare assembly committee, which included members drawn from American Foundation for the Blind, Child Welfare League of America, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Council on Social Work Education, Girl Scouts, National Council of Churches of Christ in America, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, National Jewish Welfare Board, National Recreational Association, Salvation Army, United Community Funds and Councils, Young Men's Christian Association, and Young Women's Christian Association. In addition, the following organizations have expressed their interest in this subject: American Hearing Society, Board of Hospitals and Homes of the Methodist Church, National Catholic Community Service, the United HIAS Service.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies. Similar legislation has previously been introduced by Senator KEATING of New York and Senator WILEY of Wisconsin.

#### FOOD FOR PEACE ACT OF 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, during the 6 years that I have been active in public life there is no theme that I have discussed so frequently as the necessity of using our agricultural abundance more effectively in feeding the hungry both at home and abroad.

It has always seemed strange to me for men to talk about "burdensome surpluses" of food in a world where most of the people do not have enough to eat.

For the past 2,000 years the world has been ennobled by the philosophy that out of our abundance we should feed the hungry and clothe the naked. This philosophy is not only good religious doctrine, it is sound economics and good politics.

At a time when we are engaged in a global competition with another way of life, it is all the more urgent that we use our resources to move the world toward peace and security. The only war that Americans seek is the war against hunger, poverty, and disease. A powerful instrument in that war is the

abundant production of the American farmer. Instead of regarding our agricultural productivity as a curse, we should move with greater vision and compassion to convert it to the tremendous asset that it actually is. Instead of hiding our talent in the ground or letting it deteriorate in storage bins at public expense, let us move boldly into a comprehensive food for peace program.

On January 29 of this year I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 60 expressing the sense of the Congress that "the American people must more fully and completely employ the plentiful resources of the American farmer to enhance the standard of living throughout the free world and to bolster the political and economic stability of those nations which have embarked upon programs of economic construction."

The text of that resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the abundance of food and fiber produced by the American farmer is the marvel of the world; and

Whereas most of the people of the world are undernourished; and

Whereas the American people historically have been concerned with the well-being of other peoples; and

Whereas in many nations of the free world vital economic development programs are retarded and political stability is threatened by an inadequate supply of food; and

Whereas the remarkable bounty of the free American farmer has resulted in accumulations of farm commodities for which there is insufficient domestic demand; and

Whereas the Congress seeks to reduce unnecessary expenditures, including, where possible, those for commodity storage and for foreign assistance; and

Whereas the Soviet bloc has publicly challenged the United States and her allies to economic competition in demonstrating before the world the viability of their respective economic systems: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that an agricultural abundance is one of America's greatest assets for raising living standards and promoting peace and stability in the free world; and that Congress favors action to resolve the paradox of American agricultural surpluses and world food needs by more fully utilizing the resources of the American farmer as an integral part of the United States' foreign assistance program.*

SEC. 2. This concurrent resolution may be cited as the "Food for Peace Resolution."

I am today introducing a comprehensive legislative proposal to put the above resolution into operation.

My bill, which may be cited as "The Food for Peace Act" is similar to legislation being sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY in the other body.

The basic provisions of the act are the following:

#### TITLE I

The \$1½ billion annual sales of farm surplus for foreign currencies would be increased to \$2 billion annually and would be extended for 5 years.

#### TITLE II

The Public Law 480 title II provision of surplus food grants to meet famine or emergency conditions abroad would be extended for 5 years. Food grants to assist friendly countries in the relief of chronic hunger are also provided.



## TITLE III

Continuation of title III of Public Law 480 including encouragement of church and other voluntary groups that have been distributing surplus food stocks to needy persons overseas. This section provides for, first, use by Federal agencies of local currencies derived from surplus commodity sales to purchase commodities not produced in the United States; second, barter of surplus agricultural commodities for strategic or other materials; third, grants of surplus farm stocks to public and private agencies for use in the United States in nonprofit school lunch programs, nonprofit summer camps for children, charitable institutions including hospitals, and assistance to needy persons; and fourth, grants to nonprofit voluntary agencies for use in the assistance of needy persons outside the United States.

## TITLE IV

A 10-year program of long-term supply contracts for U.S. surplus agricultural commodities that would be financed with low-cost loans extending up to 40 years and at interest rates not exceeding 2½ percent. The borrowing countries would be permitted to retire the loans in dollars, services, or needed materials.

## TITLE V

Grants of surplus agricultural commodities over a period of 5 years to help food-deficit countries, under agreements, build up and maintain minimum national food reserves—in accordance with the United States-sponsored resolution adopted by the United Nations on February 20, 1957.

## TITLE VI

Negotiation of agreements with friendly countries to establish in such countries binational, nonprofit foundations to foster and promote research, education, health and public welfare, and to grant to such foundations unexpended local currencies which accrue to the United States as repayments of principal or payment of interest on local currency loans heretofore made by the United States under Public Law 480 or made hereafter under the Food for Peace Act.

## TITLE VII

A Peace Food Administration would be established in the Executive Office of the President, headed by a Peace Food Administrator, to aid the President in carrying out the purposes of the act and also the purpose of section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. There would also be created an Interdepartmental Peace Food Policy Committee to advise and consult with the Peace Food Administrator, and also a Peace Food Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of private U.S. groups and organizations.

In addition to the foregoing, the Food for Peace Act would authorize a number of additions to the authorized uses, in addition to those in Public Law 480, for local currencies accruing from sales of surplus agricultural commodities under title I. Of these, five would permit the use of such currencies to buttress and extend social and economic development

projects and activities of the United Nations Special Fund, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Finance Corporation, and an International Development Loan Association if and when such may be established. Others would permit more effective use of such currencies in promoting international educational exchanges; research, educational development, and health and education; and technical assistance. On loans of local currencies for economic development, the act would specify a maximum interest rate of 2½ percent.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 480 of the Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is further amended as follows:*

(1) The first section (which provides the short title) is amended to read as follows: "That this Act may be cited as 'The International Food for Peace Act of 1959.'"

(2) Section 2 (which consists of a statement of policy) is amended to read as follows:

## "CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND POLICY"

"SEC. 2. (a) Because of the increased productivity made possible by science and technology, there is now, for the first time in history, no reason in physical scarcity for the continued existence of hunger—anywhere on this earth. It is now possible and practical for mankind to take cooperative steps to abolish human hunger.

"This being so, massive hunger and suffering from want of clothing, existing in the world in the shadow of unused present and potential surpluses of food and fiber, are no longer tolerable, either morally, politically, or economically.

"The Congress, while recognizing the difficult international, political, and economic problems that lie between hunger and want of clothing in many parts of the world and food and fiber surpluses in others, declares it to be the policy of the United States to move as rapidly as possible in cooperation with other friendly nations, toward putting its abundance of food and fiber more effectively in the service of human need.

"(b) Peoples who comprise one-third of the human race have in our generation achieved national independence (or are in the process of doing so) and are in revolt against the poverty, ignorance, disease, inferior status, and lack of opportunity which have always been their lot. They are determined to achieve that economic and social development necessary to national dignity and individual well-being. To mobilize their resources with reasonable speed and develop their economies to a point where they are self-propelled and self-sustaining they require substantial outside aid over a considerable period of years. If that aid is adequately forthcoming from the free world, they have a good chance to accomplish their purposes in freedom, remaining a part of the free world and contributing to its strength and well-being. If it is not forthcoming, their alternative is to seek it in the Communist world, and in the process to surrender both personal and national freedom. Deeply aware of and sympathetic with the aspirations of the world's peoples who seek in freedom greater national dignity and individual well-being, the Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to help them achieve those aspirations. The Congress recognizes that for this purpose a number of different kinds of aid are required,

but that among them food and fiber aid is a highly important form and one whose effectiveness can be greatly increased. The Congress declares that the agricultural abundance of the United States is not an embarrassment but a blessing to be used in the service of mankind, that it should be so used to the maximum extent possible, and that if it is so used it can help build essential conditions of world peace and freedom.

"(c) To achieve those larger purposes, the Congress directs that this Act shall be administered (1) so as to help other countries carry forward their own national or regional plans for development in freedom and independence; (2) so as to support the efforts and programs of the United Nations, its specialized agencies and affiliated organizations, and regional organizations of friendly countries, directed toward the same ends; (3) so as to leave wide latitude in working out details of national agreements and projects to United States Chiefs of Missions in negotiations with the governments concerned; and (4) so as to enlist the cooperation of other countries in putting agricultural surpluses more effectively in the service of human need and the economic and social development of less developed countries.

"(d) It is also declared to be the policy of Congress to expand international trade among the United States and friendly nations, to facilitate the convertibility of currency, to promote the economic stability of American agriculture, and the national welfare, to make maximum efficient use of surplus agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, and to stimulate and facilitate the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States by providing a means whereby surplus agricultural commodities in excess of the usual marketings of such commodities may be sold through private trade channels, and foreign currencies accepted in payment thereof. It is further the policy to use foreign currencies which accrue to the United States under this Act to expand international trade, to encourage economic development, to purchase strategic materials, to pay United States obligations abroad, to promote collective strength, and to foster in other ways the foreign policy of the United States."

(3) Section 101 (which relates to the negotiation of agreements) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (d), by changing the period at the end of paragraph (e) to a semicolon, and by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraphs:

"(f) seek, insofar as possible, to enter into such agreements for periods in excess of one year; and

"(g) give maximum attention to utilizing the authority and funds provided by this Act to further the economic and social development plans of underdeveloped countries."

(4) Section 103(b) (prescribing limit on appropriations) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Agreements shall not be entered into under this title during the period beginning July 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1964, which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, in amounts in excess of \$2,000,000,000 annually, plus any amount by which agreements entered into in prior years have called or will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts less than authorized for such prior fiscal years by this Act as in effect during such fiscal years."

(5) Section 103 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In carrying out programs and activities under this title, the President shall, insofar as possible, coordinate such programs

and activities with other United States and international programs and activities directed toward the same end."

(6) Section 104(e) (relating to loans for trade expansion) is amended by striking out "Export-Import Bank for loans mutually agreeable to said bank" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States Development Loan Fund created by title II of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, for loans mutually agreeable to said Fund", and by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, That funds which have accrued under this section and which are uncommitted may at the discretion of the President, be placed under the administration of the Development Loan Fund".

(7) Section 104(g) (relating to the promotion of trade and economic development) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) For loans and grants to promote multilateral trade and economic development, made through established banking facilities of the friendly nation from which the foreign currency was obtained or in any other manner which the President may deem to be appropriate. Interest on loans made under this subsection shall be at such rate, not to exceed 2½ per centum per annum, as the President shall determine. Strategic materials, services, or foreign currencies may be accepted in payment of such loans;"

(8) Section 104(h) (relating to international educational exchange activities) is amended by striking out the words "in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts" and by striking out the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: "Such currencies may also be used for making grants to United States nonprofit organizations and institutions for carrying out such exchange of persons projects under this paragraph between the United States and other countries as may be agreed upon between such organizations and institutions and the Secretary of State, but no such grants shall be made to any organization or institution which does not agree to provide the dollar funds which the Secretary of State deems necessary to carry forward agreed projects to a successful conclusion;"

(9) Section 104(k) (relating to scientific activities) is amended by striking out "but no foreign currencies shall be used for the purposes of this subsection (k) unless specific appropriations be made therefor" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and to promote and support programs of medical and scientific research, cultural and educational development, health, nutrition, and sanitation".

(10) Section 104(o) (relating to assistance to educational facilities sponsored by United States citizens) is amended by striking out so much thereof as follows the semicolon.

(11) Section 104 (relating to uses of foreign currencies) is amended by inserting after paragraph (o) the following new paragraphs:

"(p) For supporting workshops in American studies or American educational techniques, and supporting chairs in American studies.

"(q) For financing technicians and other personnel of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and World Health Organization (including necessary equipment and supplies) engaged in (i) consulting and advising on, conducting, or administering Government programs designed to relieve chronic hunger and malnutrition, (ii) consulting and advising on programs for the storage, management, and operation of national food reserves, or (iii) training local

technical, administrative, and other personnel needed to carry out such programs;

"(r) For financing research, surveys, conferences, publicity, and other activities which the President shall find to be helpful in support of the projected 'Free the World from Hunger' campaign of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization; and for such purposes and the purposes of paragraph (q) any currencies of any country available under this Act may be transferred to and used in any other country;

"(s) For financing local currency cost components of projects undertaken by the United Nations Special Fund for which such Fund pays foreign exchange costs;

"(t) For contributions, in addition to United States dollar contributions, to the capital fund of any international development association or organization of which the United States is a member which may be established as an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the purpose of making long-term loans for economic development;

"(u) For financing the preparation, distribution, and exhibiting of audio-visual informational and educational materials, including Government materials, abroad;

"(v) For transfer to the International Finance Corporation for the purpose of promoting private investment abroad under such arrangement as may be agreed upon between the President, said Corporation, and the country whose currency is involved;

"(w) For financing the services of technicians, advisers, and administrators who are nationals of any friendly country, which may be needed to further economic and social development programs in other friendly countries;

"(x) For financing relief and rehabilitation projects undertaken following disasters or for assistance to refugees."

(12) Section 104 is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and from time to time release for the general purposes of this title funds that may have accrued in excess of prospective needs for payment of United States obligations".

(13) Section 106 (which relates to determination of nations with which agreements shall be negotiated) is amended by striking out the words "Secretary of Agriculture" where they appear the second time and inserting in lieu thereof "President".

(14) Section 107 (which defines "friendly nation") is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That such term shall not exclude any nation referred to in clause (2) if the President determines that the making and carrying out of agreements with such nation under this Act will be in the interest of attaining the foreign-policy objectives of the United States".

(15) Section 109 (which relates to the duration of the program under title I) is amended by striking out "December 31, 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964".

(16) Section 202 (authorizing grants of surplus commodities for famine relief) is amended by striking out "with friendly governments or through voluntary agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "by or with friendly governments or voluntary relief agencies to carry out the purposes of section 201 and to assist friendly nations in establishing, expanding, or carrying out programs, including programs undertaken with the assistance of experts and technicians of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, and the World Health Organization for the relief of chronic hunger and malnutrition".

(17) Section 203 (which imposes limits on expenditures under title II) is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Not more than \$250,000,000, including the Corporation's in-

vestment in the commodities, shall be expended annually for all such transfers and for other costs authorized by this title."

(18) Section 204 (which relates to the duration of the program under title II) is amended by striking out "December 31, 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964".

(19) Section 304(b) (which prohibits certain transactions with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and areas dominated or controlled by the Communist regime in China) is amended by striking out "title I or title III" and inserting in lieu thereof "title I, title III, title IV, title V, or title VI".

(20) Title III is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 306. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby directed—

"(1) to dispose of its stocks of edible oils or products thereof by donation, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems appropriate, to nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with the Department of State, appropriate agencies of the Federal Government or international organizations, for use in the assistance of needy persons outside the United States;

"(2) to purchase for donation as provided above such quantities of edible oils and the products thereof as the Secretary determines will maintain the support level for cottonseed and soybeans without requiring the acquisition of such commodities under the price support program.

Commodity Credit Corporation may incur such additional costs with respect to commodities to be donated hereunder as it is authorized to incur with respect to food commodities disposed of under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and may pay ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry abroad."

(21) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new titles:

#### "TITLE IV—LONG TERM SUPPLY CONTRACTS

"Sec. 401. The purpose of this title is to utilize agricultural commodities and the products thereof produced in the United States, including but not limited to agricultural commodities in surplus supply, to assist the economic development of friendly nations by assuring such nations a stable supply of agricultural commodities on long-term credit for domestic consumption during periods of economic development so that the resources and manpower of such nations may be utilized more effectively for industrial and other domestic economic development without jeopardizing meanwhile adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic use.

"Sec. 402. In furtherance of this purpose, the President is authorized to enter into agreements with friendly nations under the terms of which the United States shall undertake to deliver annually (a) certain quantities of wheat, rice, cotton, feed grains, or tobacco, or (b) such other surplus agricultural commodities as may from time to time be available, for periods of not to exceed ten years.

"Sec. 403. Payment for such commodities shall be in dollars or in services or in strategic or other materials of which the United States does not domestically produce its requirements, as the President may from time to time determine, with interest at such rate as the President may determine but not more than 2½ per centum per year. Payment may be made in approximately equal annual amounts over periods of not to exceed forty years from the date of the last delivery of commodities under the agreement and interest shall be computed from the date of such last delivery.



"Sec. 404. Any such agreement shall include the following undertakings on the part of the purchasing nation as conditions of such contract:

"(1) That commodities provided hereunder will not replace any usual imports of the same or similar commodities by such nation from friendly nations;

"(2) That commodities provided hereunder will be used only for domestic consumption and that none of such commodities will be sold outside the purchasing nation either directly or through replacement of domestic production.

"Sec. 405. In entering into such agreements, the President shall endeavor to reach agreement with other exporting nations of such commodities for their participation in the supply and assistance program herein authorized on a proportionate and equitable basis.

"Sec. 406. In carrying out this title, the provisions of sections 101, 102, 103(a), 106, 107, and 108 of this Act shall be applicable to the extent not inconsistent with this title.

#### "TITLE V—NATIONAL FOOD RESERVES

"Sec. 501. The President is authorized to implement the resolution adopted by the United Nations on February 20, 1957 (United Nations Resolution 1025 [XI]), which was sponsored by the United States, calling for international cooperation in the establishment of national food reserves by making transfers of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of establishing such reserves. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the President out of its stocks such agricultural commodities as he may request for this purpose.

"Sec. 502. In making transfers under this title, the President may provide for delivery f.o.b. vessels in United States ports and, upon a determination by the President that it is necessary to accomplish the purposes of such resolution, for the payment of ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry abroad, and for furnishing of technical and other assistance in providing storage facilities for the food reserves so established.

"Sec. 503. (a) No assistance under this title shall be furnished to any nation or organization of nations unless such nation or organization agrees—

"(1) to use the commodities furnished under this title to establish national food reserves;

"(2) to maintain the food reserves so established at agreed levels;

"(3) to consult with and utilize the services of experts and technicians of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization with respect to technical problems of storage, management, and operation of national food reserves;

"(4) to maintain and operate such reserves in such manner that they will not interfere with normal commercial trade of the United States or other friendly nations.

"(b) The President is authorized to make transfers of commodities under title II whenever necessary to replenish reserves which are depleted as a result of famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements.

"Sec. 504. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Sums appropriated for such purpose shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the Corporation's investment in commodities transferred hereunder and for all costs referred to in section 103(a).

"Sec. 505. No grants or other assistance shall be furnished under this title after June 30, 1964.

#### "TITLE VI—BINATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

"Sec. 601. (a) The President is authorized to negotiate and carry out agreements with friendly nations to provide for the estab-

lishment in such countries of nonprofit foundations to foster and promote research, education, health, and public welfare.

"(b) A foundation established under this title shall be under the direction of a board of trustees consisting of—

"(1) a number, to be determined by the agreement between the United States and the country in which the foundation is located, of the nationals of such country appointed by the government thereof.

"(2) an equal number of nationals of the United States (one of whom shall be the chief of the United States diplomatic mission to such country) appointed by the President; and

"(3) one member, who shall be chairman, who shall be appointed by the Government of such country with the approval of a majority of the members appointed as provided in clauses (1) and (2).

Members of a board of trustees shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority, and vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointments.

"Sec. 602. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, the President is authorized to grant to any foundation established under this title for use in carrying out the purposes specified in section 601(a) any unexpended local currencies which accrue to the United States, as repayments of principal or payment of interest on loans heretofore or hereafter made by the United States under section 104. Any such currencies may be used for direct expenditure, or may be invested and the proceeds used, for carrying out this title.

#### "TITLE VII—ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 701. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President an agency to be known as the Peace Food Administration, which shall be headed by a Peace Food Administrator appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Peace Food Administrator shall serve at the pleasure of the President and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$21,000 per annum.

"(b) (1) The President shall carry out the functions conferred upon him by this Act and section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, either directly or through the Peace Food Administrator.

"(2) The President is authorized to transfer to the Peace Food Administrator the functions of any other agency which he determines are related to the functions of, and can be more effectively or economically carried out by, the Peace Food Administrator, together with any personnel or property used primarily in carrying out such functions.

"(c) The Peace Food Administrator is authorized to make such expenditures and appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable him to carry out his functions.

"Sec. 702. (a) There is hereby established a Peace Food Policy Committee which shall consist of an Assistant Secretary, or officer of comparable level, of each of the following departments or agencies: Departments of State; Treasury; Agriculture; Commerce; Health, Education, and Welfare, and the International Cooperation Administration.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Peace Food Policy Committee to advise and consult with the Peace Food Administrator concerning the administration of this Act. The Committee shall meet from time to time upon request of the Peace Food Administrator and at such other times as it may deem necessary.

"Sec. 703. (a) There is hereby established a Peace Food Advisory Committee which shall consist of representatives of the follow-

ing and such other groups as the President deems advisable who shall be appointed by the President for terms of two years:

"(1) the major agricultural organizations;

"(2) exporters of food and fiber;

"(3) voluntary agencies such as CARE and church groups;

"(4) educational groups; and

"(5) voluntary health groups.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Peace Food Advisory Committee to advise and consult with the Peace Food Administrator, and to make such recommendations as it deems advisable, concerning the administration of this Act. The Committee shall meet from time to time upon request of the Peace Food Administrator and at such other times as it may deem necessary. In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Committee shall invite a representative of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization to meet with the Committee in order that, through him, the views of other exporting countries might be heard and their interests taken into account.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall be entitled, while attending meetings of the Committee, to receive compensation at the rate of \$50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Sec. 704. In negotiating agreements under this Act, the President shall give due consideration to the internal and external political and economic conditions of the countries concerned by drawing upon the appropriate title or titles of this Act in such manner as to carry out more effectively the policy set forth in section 2."

#### NEW DIRECTIONS FOR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, few subjects on the minds of the American people and the agenda of Congress are as important as foreign aid. And probably on no subject is there so much disagreement, misunderstanding, and frustration.

There have always been a number of hard-core opponents of foreign aid in the Congress. This year, as in the past, they will oppose the mutual security bill with vigor and skill.

What I find much more disturbing is the opposition of old friends of the program who are deeply concerned over the direction in which it has been moving.

When we add the frustration in this body created by threats of Presidential vetoes of such domestic programs as schools, area development, housing, and urban renewal—programs which many of us believe to be essential to the well-being of our own country—the danger of deep and dangerous retaliatory cuts in foreign aid becomes apparent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that those of us who have supported this program from the beginning, and who believe that it is even more vitally needed today, have a special responsibility to explore the reasons for the present confusion and opposition and to propose positive steps that Congress can take to help clear the air.

I speak as such a supporter, who intends to vote for the full amount requested by the President.

#### WORKED WITH PROGRAM

I also speak from 14 years of varied experience in the planning and administering of foreign aid programs both for the United Nations and our own Government.

As the U.S. Stabilization Director at the war's end, I was concerned with the planning of our relief food shipments to Europe and Asia.

As a U.S. delegate to the first UNESCO Conference in Paris in 1946, I participated in planning the initial programs of this new agency.

As special consultant to the Secretary General of the United Nations in 1947 and 1948, I surveyed and reported on United Nations child welfare assistance programs in France, Italy, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

As U.S. Ambassador to India and Nepal in 1951-53, I had direct responsibility for staffing, planning, and administering our own first major Point 4 effort. This included the launching of the world's first major community development program, a program that now embraces 320,000 Indian villages and 180 million people.

Since leaving India, Mr. Speaker, I have had continuing first-hand opportunities to study American and United Nations aid programs in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Vietnam, Burma, Indonesia, Thailand, Formosa, Korea, the Philippines, Ethiopia, and in several African countries and territories south of the Sahara.

I have seen the near miracles that can be accomplished in the villages when the right amount of technical assistance is fruitfully combined with small amounts of capital and the active, energetic participation of the local inhabitants.

I have seen the democratic lift, purpose, and pride that new industries, improved transportation, and expanding hydroelectric power can give to old societies.

I have also seen what can happen in terms of waste and frustration when American aid is spent in the wrong place, in the wrong way, and for the wrong reasons.

#### PROBLEMS INFINITELY COMPLEX

Experiences of this kind are bound to give any observer a profound awareness of the enormous complexities with which our foreign aid administrators must contend day after day. Intricate and delicate problems must be weighed and balanced. Assorted pressures of many kinds require the utmost in tact and perseverance.

May I add that my criticisms are not intended for any individual. I have developed the greatest respect and admiration for many of the hard-working and dedicated public servants who have administered our aid programs through the years. Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State, who now has general supervision over these programs, in particular is a man of unique competence and ability.

#### ERRORS WELL KNOWN

The fact remains that errors of omission and commission in our foreign aid programs are substantial and they have been well publicized. No doubt they will again be stressed with vigor in the coming debates.

Yet when our oratory has died away, this overall aid effort will remain absolutely and urgently essential to America's immediate and long-range interests and to our hopes of building a lasting peace. We simply cannot afford to carve up the aid program; much less can we afford to abandon it.

What we must do is to introduce standards that will help assure more realistic planning and administration, and at the same time frankly explain to the American people why foreign aid is needed, what it can do, and, equally important, what it cannot do.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, we shall need a better balance among various aid programs and perhaps additional international machinery. I merely refer in passing to certain developments which I should like to see happen but which I shall not discuss today.

For instance, I would prefer that a larger proportion of our technical assistance be channeled through the United Nations technical assistance program than is presently the case.

I would like to see Senator MONRONEY's proposal for an International Development Association given more serious consideration.

In our own mutual security program I would feel happier if we could separate economic from military assistance completely.

Finally, I would advocate more emphasis on long-term loan commitments to encourage more efficient planning and to discourage waste.

No man with a realistic appreciation of the circumstances of the moment, both in the administration and in the Congress, will feel there is a possibility for major thoroughgoing revision of the mutual security legislation this year.

Most of the suggestions I have just mentioned are unlikely to receive effective consideration during the present session of Congress. But this does not mean that we are powerless between now and adjournment to compel less expediency, less waste, less confusion, and, consequently, better performance.

#### FOUR CHANGES NEEDED

As a contribution to this essential, immediate strengthening of the program, I suggest the following four changes in the present legislation, which I believe it would be practicable to make in the mutual security authorization legislation this year:

First. A revised statement of the purposes of our aid legislation, which more positively reflects America's true, long-range objectives in world affairs.

Second. A set of standards that will help channel military assistance to those nations which have genuine need for such assistance to deter Communist aggression, and which will discourage arms shipments to countries where such shipments lead to internal instability and regional conflicts.

Third. A set of standards which will give high priority for technical assistance and development loans to nations which will demonstrate a willingness to sacrifice in their own behalf and whose governments are so organized that they can use our help with a minimum of waste.

Fourth. An increase in the Development Loan Fund to \$1 billion annually. The additional \$300 million can, I believe, be saved by a reasonable application of the standards I have suggested above.

#### I. NEEDED: A NEW STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Mr. Speaker, I shall explain as briefly as I can the reasons for each of these proposals.

One of the principal reasons why we now face grave difficulties in securing adequate funds for foreign aid is the failure of the administration to explain honestly and frankly why it is so urgently needed.

Thus a reluctant Congress has been asked each year to support this effort for a variety of expedient reasons calculated to frighten or woo us into favorable, last-minute, emergency action.

Because many of these official reasons have turned out to be superficial and unrealistic, the American people have become increasingly confused and the Congress increasingly impatient.

I know of no greater tribute to our national intelligence than the public opinion polls which consistently show that nearly 70 percent of all Americans strongly support the foreign aid program in spite of their Government's failure to spell out its true, long-range objectives.

The official purposes which are now most often advanced for foreign aid are inadequate for several reasons.

They fail to do justice to America's real goals in world affairs.

They fail to appeal to the common concern for the dignity of man which we share with people all over the non-Communist world.

And they fail to take into account the intelligence and decency of the American people themselves.

#### A PREMIUM ON COMMUNISTS

The preamble to the Mutual Security Act now implies that it is "the policy of the United States to continue" the aid program only "as long as (the Communist) danger \* \* \* persists."

Thus, for purposes of qualifying for American dollars, we have officially turned communism into a natural resource like oil or uranium. In the marketplace of the cold war, a noisy Communist minority has become worth its weight in gold.

The apocryphal account of a Monacan Foreign Minister's visit to Washington to secure \$10 million in aid is well known in every world capital.

The arrangement was ready to be signed and sealed, so the story goes, when the American negotiator turned to the Monacan official and casually remarked: "I understand you have been having fearful trouble recently with your Communist agitators."

The Foreign Minister proudly replied that Monaco was almost free of Commu-



nists. The startled American official shook his head sadly. "Congress," he said, "will never stand for a grant of \$10 million to a country with no Communists."

The disheartened Monacan official returned home by way of Paris and, as a last resort, called on the French Foreign Minister. After explaining his predicament, he asked if it might not be possible to borrow a few angry, window-breaking French Communists to help bolster Monaco's application for American aid.

His French counterpart looked at him soberly. "My friend," he finally said, "I am afraid we must refuse. Although France is anxious to be a good neighbor, we need every single Communist that we have."

As long as the preamble of the Mutual Security Act reads as it now reads, Communist agitators may logically say to their Asian, African, and Latin American audiences: "The Soviet Union offers you loans and technicians to speed your economic development. For this you are grateful."

"But should you not be equally grateful to Moscow for the aid you get from Washington?"

"In their own official statement of purpose at the beginning of their mutual security legislation, the Americans frankly state that if they were not so frightened of us Communists, they would give you nothing."

#### CAN WE BUY FRIENDS?

Another supporting reason for the foreign aid program, which is often officially offered in discreet, off-the-record talks, is its alleged usefulness in buying majority support for our policies in the United Nations General Assembly.

But Mr. Speaker, is this second reason any more valid than the first?

Suppose a wealthy man came to live in a typical American community to finance a series of community improvements in return for public acceptance of his political views. Would not most upstanding, civic-minded people urge him to take his benefactions elsewhere?

Can we expect the proud new nations of Asia and Africa, and the older nations of Europe and Latin America to react differently?

#### WELL-FED COMMUNISTS?

A third mistaken argument for foreign assistance is that communism appeals only to hungry people. "Just fill everyone's stomach with rice," we sometimes hear, "and that will be the end of communism in the underdeveloped world."

This view reflects a massive lack of understanding of the Communist appeal and indeed of human nature. Frustrations which grow from injustice and the absence of a sense of belonging are far stronger motivations toward communism than pure hunger.

Indeed, if an Asian, African, or Latin American government is content to give its people food while refusing them the right to till their own land and to work democratically with their neighbors in creating better communities, the government may end up with a better fed, and therefore more dangerous, Communist minority than it had in the first place.

#### OUR EARLIER VISION

The objectives of American assistance have not always been advanced in such negative terms.

Consider, for instance, the breadth and vision of President Roosevelt's eloquent appeal to Congress and the American people in behalf of lend-lease in 1941, of Secretary Marshall's historic speech in 1947 at Harvard boldly spelling out the partnership relationships of the Marshall plan, of President Truman's Point 4 statement in his 1949 inaugural message proposing economic aid and technical assistance to the new underdeveloped nations.

In each case the objectives were magnificently positive, practical, and within our democratic tradition.

Nor did we rely alone on the eloquence of our Presidents and Secretaries of State to present America's true objectives to the world.

Year after year the Congress of the United States specifically wrote them into the preambles and statements of purpose of our foreign aid legislation.

For example, in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 the 80th Congress called for steps designed to strengthen "the principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence, based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, and the development of economic cooperation."

In the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 the 81st Congress said:

The peoples of the United States and other nations have a common interest in the freedom and in the economic and social progress of all peoples.

The efforts of the peoples living in economically underdeveloped areas of the world to realize their full capabilities and to develop the resources of the lands in which they live can be furthered through the cooperative endeavor of all nations to exchange technical knowledge and skills and to encourage the flow of investment capital.

It is declared to be the policy of the United States to aid the efforts of the peoples of economically underdeveloped areas to develop their resources and improve their working and living conditions by encouraging the exchange of technical knowledge and skills and the flow of investment capital to countries which provide conditions under which such technical assistance and capital can effectively and constructively contribute to raising standards of living, creating new sources of wealth, increasing productivity, and expanding purchasing power.

It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that in order to achieve the most effective utilization of the resources of the United States, private and public, which are or may be available for aid in the development of economically underdeveloped areas, agencies of the U.S. Government, in reviewing requests of foreign governments for aid for such purposes, shall take into consideration whether the assistance applied for is an appropriate part of a program reasonably designed to contribute to the balanced and integrated development of the country or area concerned.

Against this background, Mr. Speaker, the 1954 statement of purpose retained in this year's bill, appears unworthy of us. Its implied motivations are negative, expedient, and unrealistic.

In this critical period in history, I believe we should stop underestimating the American people. It is time to put aside the sales gimmicks and to do what needs to be done for the right reasons.

#### WHY IS FOREIGN AID REALLY NEEDED?

The reasons why the mutual security legislation is essential to America's objectives can be simply stated:

In the last 15 years a political and economic revolution of extraordinary dimensions has swept Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Seven-hundred million people have won their freedom from colonial rule. In spite of lack of capital, of technicians, and of administrative skills, they and their contemporaries in other underdeveloped nations are now working impatiently to grow more food, create new industries, and build a better future for their people.

The resulting situation is politically explosive for two reasons:

First. The utter poverty and slow pace of change in much of Asia, Africa, and of Latin America, contrasts sharply with the extraordinary wealth and economic growth of the privileged peoples of Western Europe, Canada, and the United States. This creates envy and frustration.

Second. Communism now offers the underdeveloped continents, not only the glittering Soviet example of a modern industrial nation created out of chaos in two generations, but substantial capital and large numbers of skilled technicians with which to make a similar transition. This offers harried new nationalist leaders a tempting shortcut.

Is it surprising, Mr. Speaker, to find the Soviet leaders now fishing in the politically troubled waters of Asia, Africa, and Latin America with such effectiveness?

#### SOVIET OBJECTIVE

The Kremlin's primary objective in its efforts toward world domination is to split the Western World with its 600 million highly skilled and industrialized people. This calls for the ultimate separation of Western Europe from America.

For nearly a generation the Soviet Union has been pursuing this objective by two different but related tactics.

First. Direct action against our NATO alliance such as the effort made in the late 1940's and in the present Soviet-generated crisis over Berlin.

Second. A flanking attack through the churning continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America which contain the raw materials on which Europe's prosperity depends and where revolutionary change is now the order of the day.

Forty years ago Lenin said, "The road to Paris lies through Calcutta and Peiping." He believed that control over a sizable fraction of the resources of these rich continents would enable the world Communist movement eventually to break the back of heavily industrialized Europe.

Fortunately for the world Stalin lacked the capital, technicians, and understanding of peasant Asia to follow this approach effectively. But Khrushchev has the resources and the astuteness that

Stalin lacked, and he is now using them both with vigor and skill.

#### WHAT DOES AMERICA WANT?

We have no desire to control the nations or the resources of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We seek no satellites. We have no wish to impose our ways on others.

Indeed our own Nation was born in revolution and since our earliest days we have associated ourselves with the efforts of people everywhere to gain and maintain their freedom, and to create their own futures in their own way.

Thomas Jefferson once said that the "American Revolution is intended for all mankind."

Tom Paine spoke of the small spark kindled in America that could never be extinguished.

George Washington believed that the freedom of the world was "finally staked on the experiment attributed to the American people and remarked that he felt irresistibly excited whenever in any country I see an oppressed people unfurl the banner of freedom."

The American Revolution, Abraham Lincoln said, would eventually ease the lot of people on a great portion of the globe.

Moreover, America's role of leader in mankind's struggle for freedom was accepted and understood far beyond our shores. As he watched the new countries of Latin America throw off colonial rule with American assistance after the Napoleonic Wars, Austrian Foreign Minister Metternich complained that America is constantly "fostering revolutions wherever they show themselves, regretting those that fail, and extending a helping hand to those which succeed."

Our major purpose now as then is to encourage free peoples to stand on their own feet, to make their own choices, to defend themselves against overt aggression, and to create economic and political conditions under which the principles of liberty and human dignity can take root, grow, and ultimately flourish.

Our global objective remains what it was in Jefferson's time: a world of peace in which all men may have the opportunity to develop freely and independently within the framework of their own cultures, religions, and national capabilities.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why we need the Mutual Security Act now and that is why we will continue to need similar legislation for many years to come.

#### TIME TO DEFINE OUR OBJECTIVES

The time has come to give the American people and the world a positive indication that the objectives of our mutual security program are worthy of our historic political convictions and of our democratic beliefs.

In the absence of strong Administration leadership, the Congress cannot rewrite our foreign aid program as I believe it should be rewritten. But we can, if we will, give the program an identity and purpose that not only fits the urgency and the nature of our times but which also reflects the true, long-range, global objectives of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, my first proposal in regard to this year's mutual security bill is that we clearly spell out these objectives. I have indicated the directions in which such new language should point.

#### II. WHO SHOULD HAVE MILITARY AID?

Mr. Speaker, I shall now turn to my second proposed change.

I am impatient, and I believe others here are too, with the present wasteful, and often ineffective, methods of allocating some of our military assistance. In many cases we have inadvertently created situations which have played into the hands of the Communists and increased their influence.

I realize, of course, that in certain areas which are clearly threatened by Communist aggression, military considerations often must take precedence, at least for the short haul. Western Europe, Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Korea, Formosa, and Vietnam, are all cases in point. Here substantial American military assistance remains absolutely essential.

But in two whole continents—South America and Africa, and in much of the vast arc of Asia that stretches from Lebanon to Manila—the principal threat to world peace comes not from Soviet tanks and jets but from economic strangulation, injustice, and human frustration.

#### AIDING DICTATORS

In these areas, haphazard shipments of American military equipment seldom coincide with our long-term security interests, much less with those of the people in the country concerned.

Such military assistance given on an expedient basis is almost invariably self-defeating. It adds to internal economic strains. It diverts internal efforts from constructive development. It paves the way for palace revolutions. In some cases it ties our prestige and our influence to the dubious tenure of dictatorships which are sooner or later destined to be swept aside.

Military assistance injected into these surging continents may be particularly harmful if it is given without proper regard for regional political considerations. By disrupting the delicate balance of power between a recipient nation and its non-Communist neighbors, indiscriminate arms shipments jeopardize the military and political stability of the entire area.

Internal economic factors must also be taken into account. I know of no more effective way to undermine a wobbly new government than to burden it unnecessarily with an excessive military load that prevents its leaders from focusing their attention on essential tasks like growing rice, driving out malaria and building schools, clinics, and roads.

The more arms we pour into such situations, the more we inflate the power of the military, the easier it is for ambitious officers to seize power and the further we stray from our essential democratic purposes.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I believe it is essential that we reconsider on a country-by-country basis the effec-

tiveness of our military assistance program.

We must determine precisely where we are heading with our military aid programs in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and establish more realistic standards for the granting of such assistance.

I do not propose that we recklessly repudiate old arrangements. But I believe we should insist that they be shaped to new objectives and that new agreements which fail to meet these standards should be ruled out.

#### III. STANDARDS FOR ECONOMIC AID

Let me now consider, Mr. Speaker, the need for a more realistic approach to the distribution of economic assistance.

Why is it that a dam can be built and operated with great success in one country, while in another country a similar dam is a miserable failure?

Why is it that modern equipment can make a vital contribution to increasing agricultural and small industrial productivity in the villages of some countries while similar machinery sent to other countries lies rusting on the docks?

#### DIFFERENCES AMONG RECIPIENTS

In most cases it reflects basic differences between the countries and the governments in question—differences which we have often lamentably failed to take into account.

The underdeveloped countries of the world fall into many categories.

The most favorable opportunities for American assistance exist in those countries which are not only determined to build solid economic and social foundations, but which also have the built-in capacity to implement their plans.

In such countries, which unhappily are too few in number, we should be prepared to make bolder and longer term investments of our capital and our skills.

At the other extreme are those nations which, because of lack of leadership, of administrative experience, or of courage to put through essential reforms, are clearly incapable of meeting the minimum practical requirements of rapid economic development under present conditions.

In such countries, experience demonstrates that long-term loans or investment grants for general economic development are wasteful and foolhardy.

Any effort to force the pace beyond their capacity to use the funds effectively will almost certainly fail, and failure will lead to frustration on our part and bitterness on theirs.

Between these extremes there are many variations which will require judgment and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the following five standards to measure the capacity of each country to use our long-term economic development assistance. I believe they are both practical and urgently necessary.

#### FIVE STANDARDS FOR JUDGMENT

First. The most important standard for granting American economic loans and other assistance should be that of self-sacrifice.

To become eligible for substantial long-term assistance, a nation should



demonstrate that it is making a substantial effort to finance its own national development from its own resources.

Evidence of this willingness for self-sacrifice should include a reasonably effective program of national taxation based on individual ability to pay, controls over the importation of luxuries and nonessentials which otherwise rapidly eat up foreign exchange, and a determined and continuing effort to assure the maximum number of peasant families ownership of their own land.

Second. To qualify for major American investment assistance, an underdeveloped nation should have put together a practical, comprehensive set of economic objectives and itemized the allocation of all available resources to achieve those objectives.

This assures that important tasks will be given priority, that the development program will be relevantly related to private and public income, and that the need for international help will be more accurately assessed.

If there is already a significant private business sector, it should be considered side by side in such a plan with Government-sponsored agricultural power and transportation projects in formulating the national development scheme.

Third. A qualifying country should have a reasonably substantial, competent, and graft-free civil service. Without able technicians, tax collectors, and administrators, large amounts of investment capital cannot be used to economic advantage.

Fourth. In order to qualify for long-term investment assistance, a country should also have a relatively stable government with popular roots.

Our democratic tradition makes most Americans unsympathetic to authoritarian governments of whatever persuasion. But this does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that our aid should be restricted to parliamentary democracies modeled on the West.

Indeed, we must face the fact that most of the new nations of Asia and Africa, over the long haul, may consider our own institutions unsuitable. Of these the least likely to succeed are those whose power is based on the shifting loyalties of feudal landlords and money-lenders.

By forgoing the support of both the middle-class center and the non-Communist left, such governments open the door wide for the Communists to pose as reformers and to press for united fronts. When we support such governments and they fall, our prestige and influence may tumble down with them.

Ataturk, who ruled Turkey for nearly a generation, was a dictator of the non-Communist left. We could not always endorse his methods. But since his government was rooted in popular support, he was able to put through vitally needed reforms, encourage the participation of his people, and lay the foundation for increasing democracy. Such a government deserves our help.

Fifth. Finally, in granting economic assistance, a country's political importance must be taken into account. This

will be measured by its population, the size of its territory, its resources, its influence, and its location.

#### A WORD ABOUT INDIA

Although my purpose here today is to stress general principles and not their specific application, I may say parenthetically that the Republic of India, measured against the five standards I have listed, qualifies in special degree for sustained, expanded American economic aid.

With her 400 million people and her vast natural resources, India is not just "another underdeveloped country." It is a continent comparable in size and potential political influence to Europe.

The population of India nearly equals that of Africa and South America combined. In a single Indian State, Uttar Pradesh, there are more people than in Italy, France, or the United Kingdom.

Through its tough-minded tax system and equally tough controls on luxury imports, India has demonstrated its willingness to make major sacrifices in its own behalf.

India inherited an outstanding British-trained civil service, the most efficient in all Asia, and it has kept that service at a high degree of competence.

India has completed one 5-year plan and is now halfway through her second. A third, for which American, British, German, and Canadian assistance is sorely needed, is now in process of debate and discussion.

Finally, India stands today as the one political and economic alternative to China in Asia. If the Indian democratic experiment fails, whatever long-range hope may exist for freedom in the vast arc between Tokyo and Casablanca, falls with it.

On the basis of these practical considerations, I believe that India should be assured the intensive long-term investment and technical support needed to meet its economic development objectives.

Such countries as Pakistan, the Philippines, Formosa, Vietnam, Israel, Ghana, Tunisia, Chile, Costa Rica and several others could also meet the standards I have in mind.

As the capacity of still other countries approaches these criteria, and we see that more long-term aid there can be put to effective use, they should receive similar assistance from us.

#### MORE LIMITED HELP FOR OTHERS

Countries which are unable to meet minimum development standards should tactfully be told that they cannot expect investment assistance from us until they have created their own internal basis for successful growth.

Most emphatically, Mr. Speaker, this does not mean that we should turn our backs on them. On the contrary, there is much that we can and should continue to do to help.

We should offer to assist them in the creation of a comprehensive economic development plan which enables them to use their own resources to the best possible advantage.

We should help provide tax experts, engineering survey teams, and other

technicians to create a workable administrative base.

We should encourage them to place import controls on luxury imports purchased for their wealthy upper class so that their scarce foreign exchange can be used for the essentials needed by the people.

We should urge them to inaugurate land reforms and suggest expert advisers to help them. In Japan and Formosa American Government experts took the lead in promoting a program of private land ownership that has helped the peasants in these two countries set records both for agricultural productivity and for the expansion of rural democracy.

More specifically and immediately we can help these nations to finance individual projects that are worthwhile in their own right, that are not dependent on the economy of the country as a whole, and that are clearly in the people's interest.

An example might be a modern hospital in the national capital with training facilities for doctors and nurses and an outpatient clinic system for the villages; or an expanded and improved university or agricultural experiment college.

#### SOME FLEXIBILITY NEEDED

I recognize the fact that some form of economic aid—officially called "defense support" or "special assistance"—is needed for straight political purposes, for compensatory economic reasons, to backstop military aid, or as an expedient rental fee for the use of a military base.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in recent years such aid has been unduly expanded.

Mutual security implies a partnership. It can and must be a two-way street. Yet over and over again we have been pressured into giving millions to governments to pay for the use of airbases designed to prevent their own destruction as well as ours.

American representatives abroad can and must make greater progress in placing our mutual security efforts in the military field on a true partnership basis.

#### LESSONS FROM IRAQ

My criticisms of the planning and administration of many of our foreign aid programs involve both military and economic assistance. Iraq provides a case in point. A brief review of developments there illustrates the need for a more realistic and less military-oriented approach.

On several occasions in 1953 and 1954 Nasser requested arms from the United States. This assistance was wisely refused, largely on the grounds that it would disrupt the balance of power with Israel, and thereby increase the danger of a clash between these neighboring nations.

However, in the spring of 1954, the administration agreed to send military aid to Iraq, which not only threatened the destruction of Israel, but which also was in direct conflict with Egypt for the leadership of the Arab bloc.

The Egyptians protested on the ground that this assistance represented a deliberate American effort to split the

Arab world, and that it ignored Egypt's interests. These protests were disregarded.

In February 1955, the Baghdad Pact was set up to add the military "weight" of Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan to that of Turkey. Its stated purpose was to deter Soviet military aggression toward the Persian Gulf.

In the spring of that year the Congress was informed that the northern tier added greatly to the security of the region from communism invasion and that under our ally, Nuri es-Said, Iraq was the "keystone of the central arch."

However, Nuri himself declared repeatedly that the pact was directed primarily against Israel. Asked why the Western Powers were supplying Iraq with such vast quantities of arms if, as he claimed, Iraq had undertaken no obligations toward the West, Nuri reportedly threw up his hands and laughed: "Who knows? Maybe they're mad."

In Cairo, other Arab leaders did not fail to recognize that the Baghdad Pact called for much more substantial American arms shipments to Iraq. After his protests over these shipments had again been rejected, Nasser announced in November that Egypt had negotiated a military agreement with the Soviet Union.

These were not the only factors in this cause-and-effect relationship, to be sure. But these events were part of a chain of events that led to Nasser's seizure of the canal and ended with the British-French-Israeli attack on Egypt.

#### ECONOMIC AID TO IRAQ

During this period, substantial American economic and technical assistance was also flowing to Iraq. Those responsible for administering this program reported to Congress that this help, together with the oil revenues available from the Iraqi Government, seemed to assure Iraq's economic success.

However, little effort was made to see that the people of Iraq benefited directly from our joint efforts. Thus the new irrigation programs, while vastly increasing the income of the landlords, brought only minor gains to the cultivators.

Iraq's gross national product rose rapidly. But because luxury imports were not curbed, because progressive tax programs were not introduced, and because land reforms were postponed, the increasing income served only to expand further the already explosive gap between rich and poor.

As I wrote in a book in 1957:

Iraq is richly endowed with oil to provide foreign exchange, with the great Tigris and Euphrates Rivers to provide irrigation water, and with ample land. Able engineers and technicians, well supplied with capital, are now working vigorously to develop these resources.

But engineering miracles will not in themselves create a happy orderly society. Most of the Iraqi land is in the hands of a relatively few politically powerful landlords.

Unless there are sweeping changes in land ownership, plus rural extension programs to supply improved seeds, tools and credit, the newly created income will go largely to this fortunate minority, while the bitterness and frustration of the villages increase.

In the summer of 1958, the situation blew up and Colonel Kassim's government took power. Since then Communist influence has gained steadily and qualified observers now believe that Iraq is gradually moving into a situation where Soviet control will be inevitable.

Here, Mr. Speaker, we have an example of what happens to our interests when we overlook the political, economic and local realities in quest of a nebulous military security. In this case, as in others, we helped thereby to open the doors to the very forces which we have sought to contain.

In the streets of Baghdad, Communist-led mobs now shout insults at our representatives. American military equipment which we gave Iraq to oppose Communist aggression may ultimately be used by the Communists themselves against our friends the Israelis, our allies the Turks, or even ourselves.

I may add, Mr. Speaker, that there may be other equally calamitous case histories unless we soon bring our passion for military answers to complex political situations under better control.

#### NEED FOR TACT AND FLEXIBILITY

The Iraq example and others raise an obvious further question. What about the effect of the standards which I have proposed on the leaders of unprepared nations whose good will is essential to us?

Will the system which I have proposed be construed and resented as political interference by nations which fail to qualify?

If we were to use our aid to pressure such nations into following our lead in the cold war, resentment would be inevitable. But is it unreasonable for the American people, who themselves pay such heavy taxes, to ask that their assistance be efficiently and honestly used?

My experience in Asia and Africa leads me to believe that the principles which I have proposed will be readily accepted, provided they are presented by tactful American negotiators, supported by a firm congressional mandate.

Indeed, I am confident that most governments can be persuaded that these criteria are essential in their own long-range interests. Many of them will welcome such standards as a lever with which to persuade reactionary elements within their own countries to cease blocking constructive reforms.

Therefore I propose that the mutual security bill should clearly outline the basis on which we intend our technical assistance and development loans to be distributed.

#### ONE BILLION FOR DLF

My final proposal, Mr. Speaker, involves the allocation of funds within the mutual security budget.

Although military assistance to nations which have genuine need for it must be maintained and even increased, the standards which I have suggested should result in military aid reductions in other areas.

My proposed standards for the distribution of economic aid will result in additional savings. In anticipation of such savings, and even without them, I strongly urge that the authorization

for the Development Loan Fund be increased from the \$700 million requested to \$1 billion for fiscal year 1960.

The Development Loan Fund may well become the most creative and effective foreign policy instrument that we have organized in recent years. It is soundly conceived and is being administered with increasing competence and sensitivity.

The \$700 million requested this year for the Development Loan Fund is clearly inadequate in terms of our national objectives. This figure could easily be raised to \$1 billion within the present budgetary confines of the \$3.9 billion mutual security request.

In my earlier remarks I have suggested how the \$300 million difference could be saved from other aspects of this program. But whether this extra \$300 million is derived inside or outside the program, it is clear that we can both afford it and ought to provide it.

#### NOT A PARTISAN QUESTION

Mr. Speaker, in offering these criticisms and observations, I would like to emphasize that I do not imply that our difficulties started with the election of 1952. On the contrary, many of the mistakes to which I refer were begun under the previous administration of which I was a part.

There are champions of foreign aid in the administration and in the Republican Party in Congress who are as anxious as any of us to place this essential program on a more solid foundation. Some of its influential and effective opponents, moreover, are to be found among my Democratic colleagues.

But regardless of party affiliations, I believe that the time has come for friends of this program to say bluntly in public what they have been saying in private, and to call on the Congress and the administration to make the beginnings at least of a fresh start.

If the new direction and emphasis which I have proposed is accepted by the Congress, we will demonstrate to the world that our mutual security program is more than a temporary cold war gambit, and that we have embarked on a determined, long-range program designed to give men everywhere the opportunity to live under governments of their own choosing in a world of increasing prosperity and peace.

It will curb wasteful and politically disrupting shipments of American military equipment to countries which are not under direct threat from Communist aggression.

It will help establish priorities in our economic aid allocations so that those governments and people best able to use our assistance in a fruitful and beneficial way will receive the first consideration.

It will put other governments on notice that major additional help from the United States awaits their own willingness to sacrifice as others are sacrificing in terms of internal taxes, luxury import controls, land reforms, careful economic planning and personnel training.

It will also indicate that vital though we know the foreign aid program to be, the Congress does not regard it as a



cure-all ointment to be applied indiscriminately to all international pains and bruises, no matter what kind or how severe.

Most important of all, Mr. Speaker, it will indicate the Congress of the United States is in a mood for changes in the basic legislation, that we are convinced that an intelligent overhaul of this program is long overdue, and that at the next session we will welcome a redirection of the present program by those responsible for its administration.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I would like to commend our colleague from Connecticut for what I consider a most distinguished speech. In fact, I have not listened to a speech in this field which represented the scholarship and penetrating insight and first-hand consideration that the gentleman has brought here today. I commend him for giving his colleagues the benefit of his great wisdom.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. To be more specific, when the gentleman was discussing India, having served as Ambassador there, I wonder if he would care to elaborate on what he feels an adequate program would be today for India, with particular reference perhaps to the proposals which have been initiated in the other body by the Senators from Kentucky and Massachusetts.

Mr. BOWLES. In April 1961 India will complete its second 5-year plan of economic development. They are now beginning to put together their third 5-year plan.

This is likely to be a very ambitious plan. It will include more river valley developments, irrigation, building of roads, stimulating new industries, and the extension of their rural community development program, which already includes 320,000 Indian villages out of a total of nearly 600,000, some 190 million people.

I may add parenthetically that the basis and many of the techniques of that particular program were borrowed from our own rural extension programs here in America.

Under this plan many thousands of dedicated, competent, well trained young men work in the villages to introduce better seeds, better methods of planting and plowing, new means of keeping their water pure and clean, and, above all, of stimulating the villages to build their own schools, their own roads.

The Indian Government's extension workers do not say: "We will build you a new school or a road." They say, "Your rice will soon be harvested. How many of you will be willing then to give part of your extra time to building a new school for your children, or a road so that when a child is sick a doctor may be brought in?"

This program does not come from the top down. It is a grass roots effort out of the villages where 80 percent of the people live. If we calculate the direct contribution of the villagers on the basis of only 20 cents for a day's work, it

totals in a year more than \$300 million. They actually put in more each year than the Government itself does.

In the third 5-year plan the Indian Government wants to expand this effort until it stretches clear across India.

The other objectives of the Indian third 5-year plan are not yet established. When they are established many Americans will say that they are too ambitious, that India is biting off more than it can chew.

However, we should remember that these goals will be dictated, not by us, nor even by the Indians, but by the extraordinary economic drive that is under way in Communist China. If India is to remain free it must meet this challenge.

I do not mean to say that India must match China in statistical accomplishment. Doubtless, totalitarian China will be able to do certain things that democratic India cannot do.

But India must at least be able to point to comparable progress. She must be able at the very least to say: "China may have more steel mills. But in India we have good new mills, too, and we are making considerable economic progress. Most important, we are accomplishing these things in a free society under a democratic constitution, and with due regard for human dignity. In India, unlike China, we have progress and freedom, too."

Thus in a sense it will be the dynamic pace of the Chinese Communist development that sets the goals of India's 5-year plan. And we should never forget that if India loses in its competitive effort free Asia will be disheartened and the whole world will lose.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I think we are all seriously concerned with doing the right thing about this program. I have listened to the gentleman with a great deal of interest, and I am sure we all welcome constructive suggestions as to how the program could be improved.

When the development loan matter came before the appropriations committee, as the gentleman knows, the subcommittee only approved \$100 million of the \$250 million requested, because beginning on July 1 they were going to ask for \$700 million more. When the full committee heard all of the debate on both sides, the majority of the full committee was convinced that the \$100 million which the subcommittee had approved was not needed at this time.

I may say that, in my judgment, one of the reasons why this program has been delayed or slowed was not because we did not want to do the right thing but because a lot of the Members gained the impression that this involved a lot of soft loans, that they had written to all the countries over the world requesting them: Send us your letters, send us your requests as to what you need.

When those letters came in it was stated that the total of these amounts would be required immediately. Beside the Development Loan Fund, the gentleman, of course, is aware of the fact that since World War II when all of

these programs I am speaking about began, \$82 billion has been expended and authorized through the various loan and grant programs to foreign nations and, as the gentleman I am sure knows, there are some seven agencies of Government making grants and loans in various fields of foreign aid. There is the Export-Import Bank, there is the International Monetary Fund, there is the International Cooperation Administration, there is the mutual security program among others. The Development Loan Fund is another. I do not recall all seven of them at the moment. But, these are some of the agencies of Government that are making grants and loans in the foreign aid program.

I want to say for the Record that I represent the Cordell Hull district of Tennessee in Congress, and I do not consider myself an isolationist. I was here when the program was started, but when it was started it was said to be a temporary program. Now, some 12 years later, the President has recommended a 10-year permanent program. I think it is time that there be a real analysis of the program, to determine where we are going. There is need for a genuine reappraisal of the entire foreign aid program, and I trust the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] and the members of his committee will address themselves to this task. I believe in some areas the programs are necessary and essential, but how much and to what extent is another question. I commend the gentleman for addressing himself to the need for reforms and improvements, in these aid programs. His experience in this field gives him special qualifications to point out needed improvements. Personally I have supported aspects of the program in the past. I have taken the position that since we need an insurance program the payments should be reduced as much as possible. Will the gentleman express himself—and I am sure he is capable—as to some of the areas in which improvements in this program can be made?

Mr. BOWLES. I think the gentleman and I would be able to agree on some points at least. First of all, the question of consolidation of some of our aid efforts; I hope that in the next year we may begin to bring some of these programs into closer coordination.

Several different proposals have already been made, and I think more should be encouraged. I would like to see a committee set up inside or outside Congress to consider what as a practical matter we can do to eliminate some of the overlapping responsibilities and report to the next Congress. I think this would be most helpful.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would think that it would be opportune to make that study now. Why postpone it for another year and put it off for another year? When we have need for development of projects in our own country, they are subject to rigid cost-benefit formulas. We are advised by the Budget Bureau and the administration "they must be deferred, they must be postponed, they are not essential at all," but programs overseas, are immediately approved and they

are not required to come up to any cost-benefit formula. If the Congress cuts the foreign aid program just the least bit, we are attacked as being irresponsible in our actions, and if we spend on programs which are desirable for our own country we are attacked as spenders.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is time that the Congress exercise its own judgments in these matters. Again, I should like to commend the gentleman from Connecticut for the fine contribution he is making in this important field.

Mr. BOWLES. I strongly agree. I would like to say that I have been talking about these needs for a long time. But I was elected to Congress only last November and this is the first opportunity I have had to speak here about it.

Mr. EVINS. I would like to say that I think the gentleman is making a distinct and very meritorious contribution, and I commend him for his fine efforts.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman. I have been pressing for administrative consolidation and for cutting out waste in this urgently necessary effort for a very long time.

But I do not think that the Development Loan Fund as it now stands is sufficient for its task; I believe it needs a really adequate budget and it will need it for many years to come. We have been told by some members of both Democratic and Republican administrations that this program will be needed only for a year or 2 or 3, and this has caused both confusion and frustration here in Congress and indeed throughout the world.

This effort is a long-term proposition. The new nations of Asia and Africa and the older nations of Latin America are waking up to the possibilities of a better life. Yet they do not have the capital or the technicians to do what they must do.

Modern communications spreads the news to the most remote villages of all the remarkable new things that man can accomplish—greater rice output, the miracles of medicine, of education, of industry.

The Soviet Union says to the people of these underdeveloped continents: "Only 2 generations ago we, too, were sunk in poverty. But look at us now. Through Communist techniques we have quickly become the world's second most powerful industrial nation. We have the capital and the technicians to make your efforts easier. We want to help."

This is the Kremlin's siren song, and it is effective.

Let us consider for a moment the British in the days of their greatness when their Pax Britannica brought reasonable peace to the world—although not necessarily freedom.

In those days the British exported every year nearly 10 percent of their gross national product. That is a vast amount of money. If we exported capital on that basis today, it would mean \$40 to \$50 billion of private and Government capital going abroad each year.

But economically and politically we now live in a different world. The British had no income tax, no corporation tax. Therefore, private savings could

easily carry almost the entire load of capital investment abroad.

The British also faced a relatively secure world. The British Navy, the British Army and colonial controls saw to that.

May I remind the House that foreign equipment and military technicians such as Lafayette and Von Steuben helped bring us victory in our Revolutionary War, that British and Continental European capital amounting to billions of dollars helped in the 19th century to build our railroads and our industry; and that foreign technicians such as Einstein, Fermi, and Bohr recently helped us to harness the atom.

We are now moving into a period which is infinitely more explosive and more demanding. Private American capital can play a major role abroad, and I think we should encourage our industrial leaders to do more. But there are strict limits due to the pressure of our modern tax system on the one hand, and the relatively unstable political conditions which investors now face abroad, on the other. So not unnaturally many American industrialists are reluctant to invest their money with the old assurances of the British.

Therefore, our American Government must carry a heavy load of responsibility for action.

We have this program on the books today. It is my guess that we are going to be voting for it or voting against it 10 years from today.

This is going to be a long-range effort whether we like it that way or not. We are living in a world that is not suddenly going to become orderly and self-sufficient.

Yet there is every reason for us to have confidence in what we can do. We have all seen the miracles that were accomplished, in Europe through the Marshall plan. Who would have dreamed of the remarkable developments that were made possible by our vision and capital in Europe?

Averell Harriman, who had much to do with the Marshall plan and who is just back from India, told me recently that he thought within 6 or 7 or 8 years India could generate enough of her own capital to supply the essential bloodstream of new investment from savings within India. That sounds optimistic, but I believe he may be right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The gentleman may be interested to know that about 10 years ago, I was on a program at the University of Colorado campus in Boulder, where we were discussing the new Marshall plan and point 4 programs which were just going into effect. The discussion was around the question of how rapidly could this job be done. A gentleman who had already had some work overseas having to do with technical assistance and economic development took the floor at the end of the discussion and said that he was pleased to see the enthusiasm that was present there. But he thought that we should

disabuse ourselves of the notion that this could be done in any 4-year period. He said that he hoped he would find as much enthusiasm at the end of 15 years after that time, because he said by that time we would just about be started on the task, it was that monumental. I think the American people need to understand the task in those terms.

I think the gentleman has made a fine contribution and I thank him for it. I invite his attention and the attention of the House to the resolution calling for international education cooperation, which I expect to present this afternoon.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Connecticut for his statement, for the insight, the balance, and the sound judgment that he has exhibited. Particularly I want to express appreciation that he has emphasized one of the things that I have tried to stress all these years and which needs reemphasis, with new voices, namely: We in the West have tended, in my opinion, to concentrate too much in this program on the material side of it; the calories, the guns, the powerplants, the dollars, and so forth. We have given too little attention to the fact that these folks are also human beings, with some desires that material things will not satisfy.

We have done a wonderful job with the tangibles; we have not been sufficiently sensitive to the intangibles. The gentleman has pointed that out.

Some of these peoples have worked for decades and even for centuries to get their national independence, freedom from foreign control. Just the feeling that this is at last their own country, is very precious to them. Sometimes in our very zeal to help them—what I call the imperialism of efficiency—we crowd them too much. We push them along faster than they want to or can go; we make them wonder whether after all they are masters in their own house. And a resentment sometimes develops that defeats our common purpose. It may seem to us like lack of appreciation on their part, but that is not the true explanation.

We see the people want to be free, to be apart; and we are doing our best to help them become free. But that is only half of what they want. The minute they are free, they want to be together, to belong, to be important, to be needed, to be appreciated, to be able to contribute more themselves. They want to have a sense that they are doing something important for us as well as we for them. Too often we give the impression of working for them at their problems, instead of with them at problems of concern to us all.

Sometimes we give the impression that we think we know better than they do what is best for them in their own country. Even if, because of our wider experience, we sometimes do know better how to meet a given problem, we sometimes do it in a highhanded way, without intending to do so, that alienates them. It is no use making them



fatter, stronger, or richer if we alienate them in the process.

The gentleman has emphasized that point so well today, because of his recognition that in the end it is what people think, not how much they have to eat, that determines where they will be in this world struggle.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of getting away from our usual emphasis on the quantity of our aid. People ask, "How much money shall we have in the mutual security program this year?" The more important thing is not how much is given, but how it is given; not the amount but the manner of the aid.

The world struggle is like a great election campaign. The peoples of the world are choosing sides. For which side, the free world or the Communist world, are they going to vote? In some election campaigns you may be able to win some votes here or there by passing out gifts; but in the end you get elected or defeated by what the people think of you. That depends on whether what you present appeals to them as a program that offers dignity and hope and mutual respect, for the future, not just material benefits.

If the gentleman will permit me to add an additional comment, the greatest paradox of the 20th century to me is this, that we in the West whose magnificent material achievements are the result, we believe, of certain basic spiritual values—and I mean spiritual in the broad sense of things of the spirit—have nevertheless managed to get ourselves before much of the world as if we cared only or largely about material things—food, guns, and dollars. In contrast, the Communists, who deny even the existence of spiritual values, have nevertheless skillfully managed in many parts of the world to get themselves before the people there as if they are the ones who care most about the thing of the spirit, the dignity, the equality of status, the comradeship, the relaxation of tensions, the sense of belonging, that human beings hunger for everywhere.

We have so much better a cause than the Communists but we have not done anything like as good a job of presenting it as the cause deserves.

We generally go into a country, look around and ask, How much do they need? The answer to that is astronomical.

A second question is more important, and the gentleman has mentioned it, How much can they effectively use?

A third question is even more important: How much can they self-respectingly receive, and in what manner can we best give it?

If we would always study the second and third of those questions, not just how much do they need, we would have a better program. I think it could be somewhat smaller than it is but size is not the chief essential. We have got ourselves into a position where if we try to change the program, in these directions, the bureaucracy already set up resists—as happens in all Government agencies. It is easier to go along in the established pattern. Because one country needs a

certain emphasis or kind of program, the agencies tend to give that kind of program to all other countries. The gentleman has seen countries, and so have I, where we had a hundred projects in operation, different kinds of projects. They were needed in some big country. But in some little country with different problems, perhaps only 5 main projects or 10, were essential to its future; yet because a pattern has been developed for the big ones, the form or routine is followed everywhere else. We give them all the full treatment.

I am glad to welcome the gentleman from Connecticut on our committee to help it redefine in ways that are fresh and appealing the basic objectives the Congress had had all along.

The gentleman and I will probably not agree on all the details, of course, but the kind of statement he has made is the sort that we need to have made more often and by persons who are responsible, if we are to have a program that is alive, flexible, imaginative, and adjusted to the needs of individual countries.

Congress also has to do some reevaluating of its own role in formulating and supporting the program as well as the executive agencies that carry it on. What we face is obviously a long-range problem. How in the world do you handle a long-range problem with a short-range program? Can it be expected to succeed too well when Congress appropriates a year at a time? I often think of it this way: When Pearl Harbor came, did we declare war for just 1 year, and at the end of that year, debate for 2 months or so whether we were going to fight a second year? No; we just declared war. Everybody knew that we were going to stay in that war until we won it. We did not freeze the conduct of the war. We could adjust or modify it as circumstances indicated. But we committed ourselves to carry on to victory, however long it might take. Now, we have never done that with this program. We just say, "We will go ahead for another year and then we will decide about the following year." It never gets a chance to get its roots down firmly. We pull them up to see how they are doing. How can our partners go all out when they do not know what to count on from us?

My friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, has objected that mutual security was intended to be a temporary program. Well, I remember that the farm price-support program began as a temporary short-range program, too; but we have it now nearly 20 years later.

The program for our own American Indians began about 175 years ago, I guess; but we all know we are going to continue to have it until we get the problem solved.

We must carry on this program not because we like it, but because of the nature of the task ahead of us. There is a world in turmoil and it needs more than anything else the kind of strength and leadership this country and its people are in a better position to give than any other country or people. We have to stay with it, modifying it as we go along and adjusting it to changing sit-

uations, until the threat is removed. We have to do that not primarily for the sake of other peoples but in order to have a world in which we ourselves can live in decency and security.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman. And I would like to say this. If both political parties here in Congress, and also the administration would take the position that the gentleman from Minnesota has suggested we take, with our emphasis squarely on relating the traditional purposes of American democracy to today's world, I would feel infinitely more confident of the future.

Our relationship with other human beings must be on the basis of mutual respect for their cultures, their judgments, and their opinions. If only we could be guided by such basic human considerations in our world affairs we Americans would gain a power thereby that would be greater in some ways even than our missiles and bombs.

If we cannot soon come to terms with the human race, if we cannot build solid bridges of human understanding with other peoples—at least those outside the Communist world—we will become constantly more isolated as a rich, resented minority in a world that is struggling for survival.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOWLES. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. JUDD. I think sometimes the key word to describe the attitude that we are trying to achieve abroad is confidence. To come back to the election simile—people vote for the man in whom they have confidence. The people in the world will vote for us if they have confidence in us. They will vote for others if they do not have confidence in us. It is not primarily confidence in our power; they all know our power. But confidence in our character, confidence that we will use our power with wisdom and sensitiveness and steadfastness.

There are five "p's," it seems to me, that ought to be the basis of our policy. The first is power—moral, military, and economic power. But power in support of what? Power in support of principles—our historic principles to which the gentleman referred earlier. Both Mr. Nasser and Mr. Sukarno told our subcommittee when we visited their countries several years ago, "Why, we are only trying to do in our country precisely what you did when you were under a colonial power. You fought a war against it to gain your freedom. The inspiration for our revolution comes out of your own revolutionary history." That is unquestionably the truth.

So the first two "p's" are power in support of our historic principles. Then power in support of pledges—our honorable commitments—and in support of peoples, free peoples. And then we need a fifth "p," that is patience. It takes time and patience to work it all out. If we will keep these five "p's" constantly before us, I am sure such a program gives greater hope of success in getting through the nightmare of tension, frustration, fear and uncertainty in which

we are now living than any other kind of program can offer.

Mr. BOWLES. You are entirely right. If one thinks of power only in terms of military power, how do we explain Gandhi?

Gandhi succeeded in pushing the British out of India. Yet did not have a single flattop aircraft carrier; he commanded no atomic artillery or armored divisions; he had no navy and no tanks. But Gandhi had powerful ideas, so that when the British gave India independence they gave it in an atmosphere of good will and mutual respect which Gandhi largely made possible.

I do not suggest that Gandhi's way could have succeeded against the Nazis or the Communists. They would have crushed him like an ant. But nevertheless it was an exciting testimony to the power of faith and dignity in a world that has come to devalue such influences on human behavior.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I think I ought to make known that on Saturday evening last I had the happy and pleasant experience of being in an audience which the gentleman addressed in the city of Minneapolis, numbering about 1,500, where I heard much of what you have said here today. Your message to the people of Minneapolis and throughout the State was well received, as I am sure you realize.

I had the same experience as my colleague from Tennessee had. When I came here in 1948 I came here very much in support of the then Marshall plan. I think one of the greatest administrators of this plan that we had during the life of foreign aid was one that was most unfortunately lost in an airplane accident in Iran. I refer to Dr. Henry Bennett of Oklahoma.

He was a master in this field of endeavor on the needs of the countries in the development of the program. For 6 years I supported this program in its entirety. I subscribed to it. During the last few years I have lost some of my former confidence, because of the mistakes and other misgivings in addition to the waste in the military program and the technical help offer of this country. It has rather discouraged me so that you will probably find me voting for amendments to the foreign aid program, as I did last year. But in the final result I will vote for the program.

I do not think this program has any place for military aid. That should go through the Military and Defense Department appropriation bill. Where we have provided military help for what we thought was our friends, in foreign countries, in which those very arms and military hardware were the base upon which a new dictatorship and overthrow of the friendly government happened. The latest was Iraq. Before that Pakistan, Egypt, and Burma, and other countries. We have had the experience of finding military arms that we thought would help and preserve and develop our so-called friends there, used to over-

throw the government we thought was our friend.

I have a very diversified district in the State of Minnesota. Congressman Judd and I split Minneapolis. I have one side of the river and he has the other. In Minneapolis my support of foreign aid is well received, but when I get out into my rural counties then I find considerable opposition to my support of foreign aid. There are reasons for that—a number of them.

I want to say that insofar as the State of Minnesota is concerned, our university has made a great study of whether Minnesota benefits by this program or whether it is a costly program for the taxpayers. The University of Minnesota a couple of years ago developed a statewide survey to determine, if possible, whether or not the State of Minnesota benefited or was hurt by both foreign aid and foreign trade and I may say the findings were favorable. However, I do, today find I have division in my district; the urban friendly, and the rural unfriendly. As a matter of fact, they refer to it as a rat-hole. So I do hope that the gentleman from Connecticut, along with other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee can come up with some revision of the loose operation and what I term very much waste.

I want to congratulate the gentleman for what he said in the city of Minneapolis on Saturday night. I think he delivered a fine message and an able message.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman. I might add one thing. Over a period of the next 10 years I think the American farmer will become one of our greatest internationalists. There is no way that America can solve its agricultural marketing except in terms of world markets. I believe that many of your friends in Minnesota will be applauding you in the coming years for continuing to give your support to the foreign aid program.

Mr. WIER. We will have to get a new Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. I want to congratulate the gentleman upon the address he has made. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Minnesota that it is high time something was done with our foreign aid. In fact, I think it detected a little contradiction in your own address. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman began by stating he was going to support the program in its entire amount. I do not want to be aligned as an opponent to the mutual security program at all, but, if I am not mistaken, the gentleman also said that there is enough extravagance and waste to be cut out of our foreign aid program to give more and more millions to the development loan program. If that is true, why would it not be possible to cut the amount of foreign aid in the other branches?

Mr. BOWLES. In my opinion the Development Loan Fund is inadequate for its task; indeed it is nowhere near adequate.

This is a truly constructive program. Indeed it is the one area of effort where we still have the initiative in our dealings with the world and we must see that we keep and extend that initiative.

I believe that the standards which I have suggested for the allocation of military and economic assistance can enable us to save as much as \$300 million. If we add this sum to the Development Loan Fund I am confident that it will be spent with much greater effect.

We cannot be precise, Congress cannot administer such a program. We can only except the administrators and the Executive to live up to the policy terms we lay down.

The development loan program should be extended and expanded. I would like, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] suggested, to see it authorized over several years so that better planning may become possible.

How could General Motors, for instance, plan its next year's operation with no idea of how much capital it is going to have? Any long-range development program requires some knowledge of what resources will be available.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I was not present during all of the gentleman's address. I am sure I missed a great deal by not being here.

I would like to get the gentleman's point of view similar to the one expressed by him with me over a telecast last week concerning aid to India. The gentleman has served with great distinction as our Ambassador to India and Nepal. I think it would be well for him to dwell for a few moments on the need for aid to the great subcontinent of India. I would like to get the gentleman's views on that matter too.

Mr. BOWLES. The gentleman will find in the RECORD that I have already commented rather fully on India and its 5-year plan and I have suggested things that I believe should be done.

I might add briefly that in my opinion India is the key to a free and independent Asia. If India fails to reach her democratic objectives there will be little hope that other nations less well endowed with resources and leadership will succeed.

We must see that India has the resources with which to succeed and thereby to prove to the people of Asia and Africa that freedom and democracy are practical effective means of getting things done.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. First, I wish to thank the gentleman for the very fine remarks he has made relative to this program. I would like to call attention to a poll that we took in my district, which is predominantly rural. We sent out 38,000 letters with questions relative to this program and we find a large percentage, better than 50 percent—I think



around 60 percent—of the farm people favor the program along the lines that the gentleman has suggested. They look with great favor and hope to the possibility of the disposal of our surplus farm products worldwide.

I thank the gentleman for the manner in which he has made his presentation. It certainly demonstrates a uniformity of thinking and the kind of thinking we are going to need if we are going to effect a climate worldwide that will bring about world peace.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman. I may add that I wrote Dr. Gallup recently, and asked him if he had made any polls as to where this program stood with the American people. He sent me one made a year ago that indicated, as I remember it, that 69 percent favored the full amount, without any cuts at all.

Yet, over and over again, we hear it stated right here in this body that the American people are against this effort to build a more secure and productive world. The people who are against it may write most of the letters. But I know that tens of millions of thoughtful people who apparently do not write enough letters, are heart and soul for it.

And, if only we would place this program within the familiar framework of traditional American democratic purposes and intent we will enable the American people to understand it much better and its support will grow and they will be proud of it.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to compliment the gentleman particularly for his very skillful and diplomatic presentation of a rather touchy subject. He has used the surgeon's scalpel when most of us would maybe use the meat ax. I think he has performed a particularly valuable service in indicating that the American way is not necessarily just the way that shows fear of communism or a policy of negativism and containment, but he has indicated, I believe, quite clearly that there is a positive approach; that we should reexamine our foreign policy and our mutual security program, taking out things in it that are either wasteful or improperly in it; reexamine the values of technical assistance and economic aid that will help the people of other nations help themselves and so join with us in a common effort. I believe that he has clearly indicated that in this field we require political leadership; not military leadership alone, but we need political leadership in which the opinions of the military leadership are considered and all other opinions are considered in stating our foreign policy, in determining what we will do with our mutual security program. And, I believe that he has also performed another valuable service in indicating that the Members of Congress and the American people can be perfectly loyal in having what might even be a loyal opposition approach; that this is perfectly possible and perfectly good and perfectly wise. I think most of all that we need to find a different way than we have been follow-

ing in the past if we are going to solve this problem of peace or war and to prevent the horrors of a nuclear war; to develop the efforts of the United Nations; to work out some system of international law and order. And, I want to compliment my colleague from Connecticut for the very excellent presentation he has made and for calling our attention to a problem that must be solved.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to say that I do agree with you on your thought that the emphasis should be placed on long-term loans and technical assistance. I am wondering whether you believe that what we have done in the way of foreign aid across the board has been publicized sufficiently in foreign countries.

Mr. BOWLES. I really feel that in almost all countries the extent of our help is pretty well understood.

But, let me go back, if I may, to the very point that I have been trying to make throughout this statement. People who seek thanks and gratitude for their good deeds rarely succeed in getting it. If we constantly wonder whether we have been thanked enough, we will not be thanked as much as people in their hearts are inclined to thank us. That is human nature.

In India—and I know this is true in other countries—the more modest we are, the more we understate our contribution and build up their own, the more appreciation they will feel and express.

Many times I was publicly, and privately thanked in India for what America has done. And I always replied and I meant it deeply: "If you succeed in demonstrating that democracy really works in India, if you can prove to the new nations of the world that these same ideals of freedom are workable in your country, it is we who will be grateful to you, because you will have given new meaning and conviction to the great truths on which my country has been based. So, please do not thank us. Our gratitude should go to you."

If we approach our relations with the recipient countries on the basis of such mutual respect we will make far more friends than if we wave the American flag every time we hand somebody a dish of rice or a new plow.

In the past we have boasted too much, and so we have sometimes lost the respect and understanding we have wanted to win.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I should like to commend and thank my good friend and fellow resident from Connecticut for his usually fine understanding of these problems which confront us in the world and for his dedicated attempts to offer solutions and suggestions as to some of these problems involved. Concerning this question of gratitude from other peoples and countries where we lend or

grant these many billions of dollars under this foreign aid program, I wonder if part of the reason for the fact that there is a lack of gratitude or even an indication in many areas of anti-Americanism, when we are trying to develop friendships, is the failure on our part to accomplish one of the objectives which the gentleman mentioned earlier, that is, to understand different cultures and different traditions of peoples and countries. I believe that this is particularly true in many instances on the part of American tourists to other countries and on the part of many American representatives and officials who visit these countries.

Would the gentleman care to comment on the lack of understanding of the cultures and traditions which differ from ours?

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend from Connecticut has brought up a very fundamental point.

In many parts of the world we are in trouble today, not because we have failed to do enough, but rather because we have done it in the wrong way. For instance, I wonder if what Latin America wants more from us than anything else is not mutual respect, a greater sense of partnership; a feeling that we truly respect them, for their culture and their great accomplishments?

Of course, this largely gets back to the people we send overseas. We must find more Americans ready to serve our country abroad who feel these things deeply, who can express them and live them. And I might add that their wives should understand them, too, because one who does understand these American principles and objectives can be of enormous assistance; and vice versa.

I believe that we must be much more careful in the selection of many of our people for service abroad and in their training of them and orientation. We must also encourage them to go out to the villages where most of the people live, and to understand the problems there, and to spend less time in the nations' capitals.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made and for the excellent replies he has made to the questions that have been put to him. I feel that his explanation should help the membership as well as the people in the country better to understand the foreign aid and mutual security program.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DADDARIO. We in Connecticut for a long time have followed very carefully and conscientiously the career of the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES]. He has demonstrated today a penetrating knowledge of his subject.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut has suggested a program with

five standards. One of them is a willingness on the part of a country to make sacrifices on its own behalf. He has suggested a most important feature of our mutual security program should be to take into consideration the kind of assistance and the way we give it.

If we apply that to the mutual security program, and I believe we should, how does it fit this situation? I understand the intention this year is to withdraw from Israel the direct aid provisions of the program and to confine its assistance to the Development Loan Fund which the gentleman has mentioned today, and which is very much restricted in amount. May I ask the gentleman if he does not think that Israel should be included in the direct grants program? Does he not feel that a program which has achieved a marked degree of success should be continued to the point of certainty? In an area as volatile as that in which Israel finds itself, should we not be certain that we have reached a successful conclusion before withdrawing from the challenge which faces us?

Mr. BOWLES. I am grateful to my friend from Hartford and I agree with him. The apparent cutback in aid to Israel under the mutual security program is disturbing to many of us.

I know of no nation that more clearly fits the standards which I have proposed for the allocation of economic assistance. Israel is a symbol of what a free people can achieve.

I am confident that this question will be fully explored in the Foreign Affairs Committee and consideration given to special language in the committee report designed to correct this situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Bowles] has expired.

#### EXTENDING THE VOTE TO CHILDREN BETWEEN 12 AND 21

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request just received from a group of my younger constituents, I am bringing up the subject of extending the vote to children between the ages of 12 and 21. It is unusual when youngsters of doll-playing and kite-flying age take time out from their busy day to show an interest in the affairs of their Government. While we do not expect an immediate and overwhelming acceptance of the proposal they are advocating, I think it only fair to let my colleagues and the people of our country know of their interest. Under unanimous consent, I ask that their letter be included as a portion of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., November 11, 1958.

DEAR CONGRESS: We think that the children between 12 and 21 should be able to vote, also.

It would give more of an opportunity to give their opinion. We are of age 9-11 and

can see the difficulties, but we can also see the advantages.

At the next Congress meeting we would appreciate it if you would bring it up. Thank you.

Stephen Lambert, Mark Lieb, Steve de la Torre, Peter Swenson, Phillip Bonwell, John Hubbard, Jimmy Wylie, Dave Crane, Mark Schulte, Del Renken, Frank Marino, Linda Barrows, Varonica Lieb, Charles R. Nielsen, Tom Lieb, David Ming, Philip Evans, Jerry Ryan, Jeffrey Lee, Timothy Wooten, Bob Wooten, James Brickey, John Torgerson, Larry Barrows, David Barrows, Christopher Lieb.

#### THE FARM SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, there is no domestic problem as great or as complex as the farm problem. As a representative of one of the Nation's finest agricultural districts and as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, the farm problem is uppermost in my mind. However, a person does not need to be on the Agriculture Committee or even from a farm district to realize the devastating effect which the present agricultural crisis is having on our economy. All one has to do is get the record out and study it over even in a casual manner to discover that many of the economic ills affecting our entire Nation's economy can be traced back to the farm situation. We have millions of unemployed today, the most of which could be put to work producing the things which farmers want and which farmers need to buy if the farmers had the money with which to buy them. Not only would the farmers be buying if they had the money, but they would start a chain reaction and the entire economy would be benefited.

The overlying problem facing agriculture is lack of price for the commodities produced, overproduction of commodities already in surplus, a great expense to the taxpayer for storage costs, and in general a demoralized condition which has been enhanced and even instigated by bungling administration practices which appear to have only the end result of completely destroying the farm program.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the farmer must have a program to assist him to organize to compete to obtain a price, and effect production limitations. We are all idealists to the extent that we should like to see the farmer able to operate strictly on the law of supply and demand. But we are also realists to the extent that we know that with so many millions of farmers they are unable to organize to effectively stabilize either price or the amount of production.

A quick rundown of some of the important statistics regarding the farm situation point most graphically what I am saying.

First. On an average our farmers are receiving only about 80 percent of a fair price for their commodities.

Second. There is about a \$9 billion surplus of farm commodities.

Third. The Department of Agriculture is already predicting that about all of those commodities in surplus will be increased this crop year.

It has been estimated that the average yearly loss of income for our farmers from 1951 through 1957 in the State of Iowa alone has been over \$1 billion. This is an alarming fact, Mr. Speaker. According to these figures, during the past 7 years we would have had over \$7 billion in Iowa which now is forever lost. Other States in the Midwest have suffered proportionately.

It seems that the American farmer has been singled out for special "surplus price depressing" treatment. According to Assistant Secretary of Defense Perkins McGuire, who appeared before the House Appropriations Committee, the armed services have \$60 billion worth of surplus equipment that is in warehouses right now. For the most part these are usable items and they are increasing this stockpile at the rate of \$9 billion a year. There are other stockpiles but we have had the wisdom in industrial circles to keep these stockpiles off the market—and we do not even talk about them being a threat to the market; therefore they don't affect the price. But it seems there are spokesmen who, in fact, should be talking in favor of the welfare of the farmers of our Nation but who continually inflict the fact of commodity surpluses upon the minds of the people so that surpluses have become the greatest bogey to farm prices of all time.

There are also official spokesmen who continually tell our farm people to give up and get off the farm. Let it become big business. Let it become a harsh, cruel commercial enterprise and forget the type of living one finds on the farms.

There are those who have espoused a philosophy, and I regret that much of it has been enacted into law, that if the price is low enough, then our farmers will plant something on which the price is higher. But, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is unable to find commodities today where there is a decent price at all, let alone a higher price. We are witnessing today the distressing fact that this philosophy is a total failure. There is no wisdom at all in forcing our farmers to produce themselves into bankruptcy. We are losing farm families, and the farmland is going into larger operations. These are the facts—it is happening in Iowa—it is happening in every State of the Union.

I have worked on this problem, I have thought on this problem, I have studied this problem perhaps more than any other one single problem in all my life. And after serious deliberation I am thoroughly convinced that our farm people want a farm program which is sensible and one which will do the job of getting prices up off the floor and one which will get production back on an orderly basis. I am convinced that our farmers want only a fair share and I am certain that our city citizens want our farmers to have a fair share. But more than this, I know our farm people well enough to



know that they do not want the people in towns to carry a high burden of taxation and pay prices out of reason for food and food products. On both sides there is great desire for fairness and fairness is all that I or anyone else can rightly ask.

What we need and must have, Mr. Speaker, is a farm program which will give a fair price for farm commodities, which will reduce the surplus, which will take fewer tax dollars and which, while doing this will give all our people an adequate diet at a reasonable price. This is the kind of plan I have been working on and one which I intend soon to introduce in bill form. Let me outline some of the features of the bill which I hope to have ready in a matter of just a few days.

First. Under the provisions of this plan the farmer will place 10 percent of his tillable acres in a conservation base on which he would receive no Government pay at all. He would idle these acres as his contribution to cut down production. He would even seed down these acres without cost to the Government.

Second. Each producer will place 25 percent of the remaining tillable acres in the conservation base for which he would receive a payment in kind of surplus crops. The payment in kind would be at a rate of two-thirds of the regular per-acre yield of the farm on which the acres are placed in the conservation base. You see here we will be making the surplus pay itself out of its own problem.

Third. On the remaining acres—which are in fact 67½ percent of the original total—the farmer can plant anything he wants to plant just so long as he does not plant any one crop on more than 50 percent of the total cultivated acres. This gives the farmer the freedom to plant what, where, and when he wants to plant. On these crops the producer qualifies for 90 percent of price supports.

Fourth. There is, under this plan, a \$10,000 limit for any one producer for price-support loans.

Fifth. Producers with farms of 30 acres or less can enter or remain out of the program at their option.

Sixth. Those producers violating the provisions of the program will be subject to a penalty of \$10 per acre for each of the first 5 acres and \$50 per acre for each acre in violation over 5.

Seventh. The Commodity Credit Corporation, when selling surplus commodities for any reason, will be required to purchase equal amounts on the market to place back in storage, in order to stabilize the market unless the price on the commodity sold in the first place is 90 percent of parity or over.

Eighth. This program will be voted by all the producers of wheat, corn, oats, barley, rye, flax, sorghum grains, soybeans, and rice.

Ninth. Tobacco, peanuts, wool, sugar beets, and cotton are not included in this program and the acreage of these commodities is not included in the tillable acreage of this program.

So, in brief, the program does this:

First. It cuts production with the farmer contributing 10 percent of his total tillable acreage. The surplus will pay for more acres placed in the conservation base.

Second. Surpluses will be held off the market unless the price is right.

Third. The farmer will have freedom to plant the crops he wants to plant.

Fourth. This plan will help those who need the help—our family farmers.

Fifth. The price will be raised more by the cutting down of production but also by price supports.

Mr. Speaker, this is a plan which is sensible, which will not be costly, and which will go a long way in solving some of the most complex problems facing America today on the domestic front. I invite consideration and discussion on this subject. I plan to make further remarks about this proposal when the bill is actually ready for introduction.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COAD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BROCK. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his very forceful and intelligent statement. I would like to associate myself with those remarks. I have recently noticed a poll taken by the National Farm magazine, wherein they stated that farmers want no controls whatsoever. However, before coming to Congress in this session I spent 28 years as a farmer. I served as president of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association, which embraces all States from Pennsylvania to Colorado. I believe I know the thoughts of the farmers. The farmer does not want to produce and place his products in surplus. Now the farmer is willing to take a leaf from the pages of General Motors. General Motors does not produce Chevrolets by the thousands and tell their dealers to sell them at whatever they can receive for them. I believe the farmer is willing to produce for the market and is anxious to produce for the market.

I noticed in your No. 1 statement—and I am sure the farmers would agree in this—that they take 10 percent of their tillable acres and do not receive one cent of Government funds. I am sure that if this program is presented to the farmers they will wholeheartedly back that program.

When the distinguished gentleman from Iowa introduces his bill, I would be most happy to introduce a companion bill.

Mr. COAD. I can assure the gentleman he will be afforded that opportunity, and I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COAD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I would like to say that we in Iowa are proud of the leadership you have given the State of Iowa in the Committee on Agriculture. Certainly your remarks have been thoughts in my mind. I

have one regret, however—that we have to think in terms of curtailing production. It appears we are going to have to think seriously in this direction, too; but we also must seek ways to use the food that we have to feed the hungry people around the world.

I want to congratulate the gentleman in presenting this sensible program, and I hope he will continue to study it further.

Mr. COAD. I thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] who knows that I have been interested in a food for peace program for a long time which would take a great amount of our surplus agricultural commodities and put them to a most worthwhile use. As I am sure all will agree the only real reason we have a surplus is that we have not been sufficiently wise or have not planned well enough to make worldwide distribution of what we have by way of food products. When we get our distribution management geared in a proper manner I am sure that our food supplies will be used for food everywhere as they should be.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa certainly deserves praise for meeting the need for a constructive farm program. It is easy enough to criticize Secretary Benson and the Republican administration, but we do not fulfill our obligations unless we come forward with constructive proposals of our own.

The gentleman from Iowa has promised to expand further upon his basic ideas. I shall look forward to this and would hope that he will include in his remarks two things of great interest to those of us in urban areas who recognize the importance of relative prosperity for the agricultural population of our country, and who, at the same time, wish to protect our constituents from rising food prices.

First, I trust the gentleman from Iowa will give us an analysis of the effect, in his estimate, of the proposals he is making, on food prices to the consumer.

And second, that he discuss whether or not it would be advisable for this Congress to initiate a searching inquiry into the spread between the prices received by farmers and the prices paid by consumers. The Committee on Agriculture has conducted, in the past, investigations which resulted in the conclusion that an excessive spread did exist. It would seem high time that we find out why and what should be done about it.

May I again offer my congratulations to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], for his constructive and able leadership in one of our country's most pressing problems.

Mr. COAD. I thank my friend from California, and wish to assure him that I will endeavor to cover the points he has raised when I address the House next Monday on this general subject.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks following my address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

#### INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution jointly with 31 other Members of the House and 29 Members of the Senate, who are joining the junior Senator from Wyoming, Senator McGEE. This resolution calls for the development and carrying forward of an expanded program of international educational cooperation.

In light of the excellent statement made in this House earlier today by the Member from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] and the discussion that took place, I think it especially appropriate that we place this resolution before the House on this day.

This concurrent resolution calls for the development and carrying forward of an expanded program of international educational cooperation. It calls upon our Government to encourage the United Nations to develop a plan for international educational cooperation that would best serve the needs of the several member countries as well as the cause of world peace and international economic and social development.

It recognizes that this Government possesses substantial sums of foreign currencies which can be used to finance such a program and in effect offers to do so. Actually, we currently possess almost \$2 billion in such currencies and if any of the food for peace resolutions become effective or if Public Law 480 is extended, we can expect to accumulate even more.

An educational program of substantial magnitude could be operated using perhaps only 5 percent of these amounts.

The United States has been the beneficiary of a tremendous amount of good will from the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt acts now in operation. Individually these are precedents for this resolution. Similarly, Great Britain has over many years benefited immensely from the good will arising out of the Rhodes scholarships, as Rhodes scholars now serving in the House and Senate could easily attest.

The tragic fact is that many of the other countries of the world have lived in substantial isolation. The countries of Southeast Asia have not enjoyed long and abiding relationships at the cultural and educational level. Indeed, they have had only a minimum of trade relation with each other.

International educational centers in this area would provide a continuing focus of experience for people of neighboring lands. These contacts are free and productive both ways.

Over the years patterns of international cooperation should surely be expected to emerge from such centers. Similarly, the people of the African countries have not enjoyed traffic or con-

tact with each other except to a very limited extent along the fringes.

The development of regional educational centers within this area should be of great benefit toward peaceful development of Africa.

No doubt countries in South and Central America would also welcome the opportunity, within the framework of United Nations planning and support, for creating suitable educational institutions. Anything we can do to help neighbors to know each other within the context of a free and cooperative experience will be most beneficial.

The only time that I have seen Arabs and Israeli in a mood to discuss common problems of the human race in a cooperative spirit was within the context of a group of foreign students exchanging views under educational sponsorship.

Incidentally, this suggests the Middle East as another area in which wider contact under international auspices between citizens of neighboring countries could be productive of a more peaceful development.

So much for the background and philosophy of the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Let me take just a moment to explain the immediate event which prompts the formation of this resolution. Some of the Members may have noticed the communique from the Council of SEATO—South East Asia Treaty Organization—which appeared in the New York Times on Saturday, April 11.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the full text of the communique at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The communique is as follows:

#### SEATO COUNCIL'S COMMUNIQUE

The fifth meeting of the SEATO Council was held in Wellington from April 8-10, 1959, under the chairmanship of the New Zealand Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, the Right Honorable Walter Nash.

The Council is conscious that the security of any one region is linked with that of other areas of the world and that therefore it cannot effectively discharge its responsibilities without taking account of major developments elsewhere.

It accordingly attaches special importance to its annual exchange of views on the general international situation. This year's discussion was considered by Council members to have been extremely valuable. Its freedom and frankness reflect the atmosphere of full confidence and mutual understanding which exist among its members.

#### SARASIN COMMENDED

The Council discussed reports and recommendations by the Council representatives, the military advisers and the Secretary General, and in the light of them gave directions with regard to the activities of the organization in the coming year. The Council commended the effective work of the Secretary General, Nai Pote Sarasin, and his staff.

The members of SEATO reaffirm their undertaking in article 1 of the Manila treaty to seek the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

The members of SEATO reemphasized their common determination to resist aggression. They are convinced that SEATO is providing an effective deterrent to aggression and is demonstrating the value of a collective security organization established in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

#### CONFIDENCE INCREASED

They noted that since the establishment of SEATO 4 years ago no aggression against the treaty area has been attempted. Confidence and stability have noticeably increased. This is in marked contrast to the threatening situation which existed when SEATO was formed in September 1954, and is ample evidence of the steady influence of the alliance.

However, during the past year, developments in the Taiwan Straits of Formosa and elsewhere have demonstrated that the Communists are still prepared to pursue their objectives by violence up to the point where they encounter firm resistance.

Despite the continuing possibility of open aggression, the principal threat to the security and independence of the treaty area now is being presented in more indirect forms. These call for imaginative and varied countermeasures.

Mobility and flexibility have long been characteristic of the SEATO alliance. Similar qualities are being developed in response to the diverse nature of the Communist challenge.

The Council members are aware of the opportunities afforded for subversive activities in situations where basic problems of hunger, lack of opportunity and underdevelopment remain unsolved.

In these circumstances not only ceaseless vigilance, but also positive measures, are the price of freedom.

So far SEATO has done much to publicize and expose throughout the treaty area the objectives toward which subversion is directed and the methods by which it operates.

The SEATO Council remains conscious of continuing danger and has agreed that during the coming year arrangements should be made for the further strengthening of this aspect of SEATO's work. For example, it is proposed that a meeting of experts on countersubversion should be held in Pakistan.

#### ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ACTION

The Council members recognize the needs for continuing action in the economic and social spheres.

Under article 3, SEATO members are pledged to cooperate in the economic field. During the last 4 years considerable progress has been made in the development of economic measures in consonance with treaty objectives.

#### THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY

It was recognized that the raising of living standards and the provision of opportunity for advancement are important to the security of the area. It was agreed that poverty and underdevelopment are problems affecting several countries in the area and must be dealt with on the broadest possible basis. Account was taken of the substantial volume of aid already afforded under the Colombo plan, United Nations, and bilateral programs.

Special attention is paid by SEATO to questions arising out of treaty commitments. These include shortages of skilled labor, strains resulting from defense preparedness and the needs of underdeveloped areas.

Several multilateral economic activities directed toward solving the above problems now are gaining momentum. A number of skilled labor projects have been started and the SEATO Graduate School of Engineering in Bangkok is scheduled to open in September of this year. With reference to the lat-



ter program, additional substantial offers of assistance were accepted with pleasure by the Council.

#### RURAL CENTERS FORMED

On the initiative of Thailand, the Council representatives were instructed to study the feasibility of setting up in the Asian member countries rural development centers equipped to give vocational guidance and to advise the population on ways and means to improve their livelihood, health, and education and information facilities.

The Council welcomed and approved a U.S. proposal to initiate a special project in cholera research and invited member governments to participate in this project. The Council believes that it would be useful to undertake a concentrated program aiming at assisting in the better control and if possible the eradication of the scourge of cholera.

SEATO is concerned with the study of the effects of Communist economic activities in the treaty area. While the expansion of legitimate trade by all countries of the world is to be encouraged, it is in the interests of international order that where the Communist economic activity is clearly dictated by political motives this should be identified and exposed.

#### CULTURAL PROJECTS

The Council approved the outlines of a long-term program of multilateral cultural projects which will supplement the substantial bilateral contacts which already exist. Special importance was placed upon the continuance of the award of scholarships, professorships, fellowships, and traveling lectureships in member countries and upon the holding of a conference of leaders of universities.

The Council believes that the present programs have been conspicuously successful and indicate that diversity of culture and tradition can in fact enrich mutual understanding and trust.

The Council noted with special pleasure the progress toward self-government and independence being made in territories administered by member countries. This constitutes a practical example of the manner in which the principles of the Pacific Charter are being fulfilled by member countries.

It illustrates that SEATO's concern for stability and security is no barrier to action by its members to promote political progress and social change.

#### TIBETAN SITUATION NOTED

The Council noted the stark contrast between these developments and the situation in Tibet and other areas subject to Communist domination.

As members of the free-world community, the members of SEATO share the general concern at developments in Tibet and the widely expressed abhorrence of the violent and oppressive measures employed against the Tibetan people.

The Council noted the report of the Secretary General on his visits to NATO and Baghdad Pact headquarters. They agreed that there was value in the maintenance of contacts of this nature with other collective security organizations faced with similar tasks and problems.

In noting and approving reports of the military advisers and their recommendations for future activities, the Council reaffirmed the necessity for continued planning of defensive measures against possible aggression directed at the treaty area.

During the year Brig. L. W. Thornton of New Zealand assumed the post of Chief of the SEATO Military Planning Office. The Council commended the work done under his leadership which has proved the value of this central and permanent planning machinery.

Further military exercises were held during the past year. All were of a defensive

and training character and forces or observers of all member nations participated. Exercises of this nature have special value in improving coordination and the level of training. In the event of the need to resist aggression, SEATO's effectiveness must depend on the ability of its forces to operate together in combination. It was accordingly agreed to continue the program of military exercises during the coming year.

#### BUDGET PLAN APPROVED

The Council approved budget estimates for the year 1959-60 of \$896,860 covering the costs of civil and military headquarters and the various programs undertaken by the organization.

The Council accepted with pleasure an invitation extended by the U.S. Government to hold its next meeting in Washington in 1960.

Members of the Council joined in expressing their regret that illness had prevented the United States Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, from attending this fifth meeting. Tributes were paid to the special and long-standing association of Mr. Dulles with the establishment and work of SEATO, and a message of sympathy was sent to him by the Chairman on the Council's behalf. A similar message was sent to Mr. Felixberto Serrano, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, who had also been prevented by illness from attending the meeting.

The Council expressed its gratitude to the New Zealand Government and the people of Wellington for their hospitality and welcome, and its appreciation of the efficient arrangements made for the conference. The meeting closed with a warm vote of thanks to the Chairman, the Right Honorable Walter Nash.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the communique includes the following paragraphs which I should like to read here:

The Council members recognize the needs for continuing action in the economic and social spheres.

Under article 3 SEATO members are pledged to cooperate in the economic field. During the last 4 years considerable progress has been made in the development of economic measures in consonance with treaty objectives.

#### THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY

It was recognized that the raising of living standards and the provision of opportunity for advancement are important to the security of the area. It was agreed that poverty and underdevelopment are problems affecting several countries in the area and must be dealt with on the broadest possible basis. Account was taken of the substantial volume of aid already afforded under the Colombo Plan; United Nations and bilateral programs.

Special attention is paid by SEATO to questions arising out of treaty commitments. These include shortages of skilled labor, strains resulting from defense preparedness and the needs of underdeveloped areas.

Several multilateral economic activities directed toward solving the above problems now are gaining momentum. A number of skilled labor projects have been started and the SEATO Graduate School of Engineering in Bangkok is scheduled to open in September of this year. With reference to the latter program, additional substantial offers of assistance were accepted with pleasure by the Council.

#### RURAL CENTERS FORMED

On the initiative of Thailand, the Council representatives were instructed to study the feasibility of setting up in the Asian member countries rural development centers

equipped to give vocational guidance and to advise the population on ways and means to improve their livelihood, health, education and information facilities. \* \* \*

#### CULTURAL PROJECTS

The Council approved the outlines of a long-term program of multilateral cultural projects which will supplement the substantial bilateral contacts which already exist. Special importance was placed upon the continuance of the award of scholarships, professorships, fellowships and traveling lectureships in member countries and upon the holding of a conference of leaders of universities.

The Council believes that the present programs have been conspicuously successful and indicate that diversity of culture and tradition can in fact enrich mutual understanding and trust.

Now, I read at so great length because the graduate school of engineering scheduled to open in Bangkok in September this year is actually being developed under a contract with Colorado State University at Fort Collins in my district.

The director of research of the university visited with me upon his recent return from Bangkok. He reported the great enthusiasm with which the countries of Southeast Asia were welcoming the creation of this graduate school of engineering.

As we talked the matter over, it seemed obvious that this kind of thing should be expanded. There is need for more than graduate engineers. We need teachers colleges to provide the personnel who can train the ordinary citizens in literacy and bring them through elementary and secondary education.

We need to provide a broader base of prospective students for colleges and universities. Many of the smaller nations do not have an adequate base of population or resources to undertake the full range of collegiate and university development.

Regional centers are thus the most practical means as well as the most economic means of providing centers especially for advanced study.

In the week since this resolution was first drafted, I have been pleased at the immediate favorable response it has received. This year is an unusually favorable year within which to take this step forward. Indeed, I feel if we wait much longer, it may be too late.

In light of the discussion earlier this afternoon about the attitude of the American people, I should like to digress for just a moment.

May I call to the attention of the Members of the House the attitudes expressed by a number of persons in the Denver metropolitan area who have taken part in the program "Great Decisions."

Some 600 discussion groups involving some 6,000 persons over a 9-week period discussed the great decisions which face this Nation. Under recent date the director of the Social Science Foundation of the University of Denver, Dr. C. Dale Fuller, sent me a summary of the opinion ballots.

I shall ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the ballot and responses from the adult vote of some 1,700

persons, because I think Members will be interested in the substantial unanimity among informed citizens from all walks of life with respect to decisions we are here called upon to make.

May I at this point simply recite two or three of the significant points of agreement?

In relation to our Western allies, for example, the voters voted 86 percent for bolder policies to solve economic and social problems in the underdeveloped areas.

Some 88 percent said in relation to the non-Communist underdeveloped world that we should place less emphasis on building the military capacities of the underdeveloped allies and more on their economic and social development.

With respect to the Middle East, 82 percent agreed that the United States has a moral and ethical responsibility to help people of that region realize their aspirations for better health, working and living conditions, and that our help should depend upon the willingness of local leaders to cooperate and commit their own resources.

With respect to Latin America, 79 percent called for the United States to improve educational systems.

With respect to world economic programs, 79 percent would have the United States provide more scholarships to students from underdeveloped areas.

With respect to our general approach to problems of the technological age, 96 percent said the United States should share its scientific and technological skills more extensively with the rest of the world and try to benefit from the knowledge of other advanced nations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion ballot be printed in full as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

#### OPINION BALLOT

(The great decisions of U.S. foreign policy must, under our democratic system, be made by the people. What basic directions do you believe U.S. policy should follow? And what specific policies—now being debated—do you support or reject? Discuss the facts, make up your mind and make your opinion count.)

(1,690 adult votes in Colorado)

#### FACT SHEET NO. 2

##### Section I. Basic approaches to U.S. policy in a divided world

1. Which of the following possibilities, in your opinion, does the United States need to take into account in building a realistic, long-term foreign policy? (Check all choices you agree with, avoiding contradictions. If you are uncertain, or feel you do not have enough evidence to answer "yes" or "no," check the "can't answer" box):

Cold war, in one form or another, will probably continue for some time to come.

(a) Yes, 99 percent.

(b) No.

(c) Can't answer.

Conflicts in interests among non-Communist nations will probably be with us for some time to come.

(d) Yes, 99 percent.

(e) No.

(f) Can't answer.

Communist influence in the world can be "contained" by a system of military alliances.

(g) Yes, 13 percent.

(h) No, 66 percent.

(i) Can't answer, 21 percent.

Continued negotiation on cold war issues is desirable.

(j) Yes, 79 percent.

(k) No.

(l) Can't answer.

Other non-Communist nations have the right to independent and even neutral cold war foreign policies.

(m) Yes, 89 percent.

(n) No, 1 percent.

(o) Can't answer, 1 percent.

A strong and well-coordinated Western alliance is essential to U.S. security.

(p) Yes, 80 percent.

(q) No, 1 percent.

(r) Can't answer, 1 percent.

The people and resources of the non-Communist underdeveloped world are vital to U.S. security.

(s) Yes, 89 percent.

(t) No, 1 percent.

(u) Can't answer, 1 percent.

#### Section II. U.S. policies in a divided world

2. On the basis of the above assumptions what U.S. policies would deal most effectively with a divided world? (Check all choices you agree with, avoiding contradictions):

In relation to our Western allies:

(a) Closer coordination of cold war political and military policies, 80 percent.

(b) Closer coordination of economic policies, 80 percent.

(c) More U.S. independence in foreign policy, 10 percent.

(d) Depend less on allies and concentrate on building U.S. economic and military power, 8 percent.

(e) Bolder policies to help solve economic and social problems in the underdeveloped world, 86 percent.

(f) More flexibility in dealing with the Communist powers, 45 percent.

(g) Refuse to be concerned with "competition" from the Communist powers, 8 percent.

In relation to the non-Communist and underdeveloped world:

(h) Attempt to enlarge the anti-Communist alliance system to include more nations on the borders of the Communist world, 38 percent.

(i) Attempt to persuade the rest of the non-Communist world to adopt firm anti-Communist policies, 37 percent.

(j) Place less emphasis on building the military capacities of underdeveloped allies and more on their economic and social development, 88 percent.

(k) Invest in greatly expanded trade and economic growth throughout the non-Communist world, 72 percent.

#### FACT SHEET NO. 3

##### Section I. Basic approaches to U.S. policy toward the Communist powers

1. Which of the following possibilities, in your opinion, does the United States need to take into account in building a realistic, long-term foreign policy? (Check all choices you agree with, avoiding contradictions. If you are uncertain, or feel you do not have enough evidence to answer "yes" or "no," check "can't answer"):

It is possible for Communist societies to match the West in technology, production and satisfaction of consumer wants.

(a) Yes, 91 percent.

(b) No, 8 percent.

(c) Can't answer, 1 percent.

A serious conflict in national interests, between the Soviet Union and Communist China, is possible.

(d) Yes, 89 percent.

(e) No, 5 percent.

(f) Can't answer, 6 percent.

Further revolutions in satellite Europe are possible.

(g) Yes, 78 percent.

(h) No, 8 percent.

(i) Can't answer, 9 percent.

An "evolution" of Communist society, leading toward greater personal freedom, is possible at least in the Soviet Union.

(j) Yes, 83 percent.

(k) No, 10 percent.

(l) Can't answer, 6 percent.

As the Communist states grow in economic power we can expect greater cold war emphasis on economic competition.

(m) Yes, 94 percent.

(n) No, 1 percent.

(o) Can't answer, 4 percent.

All-out war with the Communist powers is always a possibility for which the West must be prepared.

(p) Yes, 84 percent.

(q) No, 5 percent.

(r) Can't answer, 7 percent.

The West can best prevent the further spread of communism through adequate military preparedness.

(s) Yes, 23 percent.

(t) No, 59 percent.

(u) Can't answer, 15 percent.

All-out war is unlikely; United States must concentrate on world economic and social development.

(v) Yes, 65 percent.

(w) No, 16 percent.

(x) Can't answer, 13 percent.

#### Section II. Specific U.S. policies to deal with the Communist powers

2. Which of the following policies (proposed and in effect) deal realistically with the Communist powers? (Check all choices you agree with, avoiding contradictions):

(a) Western embargo on trade in strategic materials with the Communist bloc, 53 percent.

(b) U.S. total embargo on trade with Communist China, 21 percent.

(c) Concentration of U.S. foreign aid in countries which are U.S. military allies, 28 percent.

(d) U.S. commitments to reduce trade barriers and expand trade in the non-Communist world, 83 percent.

(e) U.S. military and economic assistance to Yugoslavia, 49 percent.

(f) U.S. economic assistance to Poland, 51 percent.

(g) U.S. refusal to have full diplomatic relations with Communist Albania, Bulgaria, China, Hungary, and Rumania, 18 percent.

(h) Present level of U.S. information programs overseas, 28 percent.

(i) U.S. assumption that communism in its present form is a passing phase, 11 percent.

#### FACT SHEET NO. 4

##### Section I. Basic U.S. approaches to the Middle East

1. Which (if any) of the following principles would serve as a realistic basis for U.S. policy toward the Middle East? Note that most of these statements do not necessarily contradict each other. If you cannot answer "yes" or "no," are uncertain or feel you have insufficient information, check the "can't answer" box:

United States has a moral and ethical responsibility to help people of the region realize their aspirations for better health, working and living conditions.

(a) Yes, 82 percent.

(b) No, 7 percent.

(c) Can't answer, 5 percent.

United States help in social and economic development of the area should depend on the willingness of local leaders to cooperate and commit their own resources.

(d) Yes, 74 percent.

(e) No, 6 percent.

(f) Can't answer, 8 percent.



United States should recognize that Arab nationalism is a legitimate force in the area, and we should try to accommodate our policies to this force.

- (g) Yes, 86 percent.
- (h) No, 3 percent.
- (i) Can't answer, 8 percent.

United States should not be so deeply involved as it is in Arab politics and rivalries of the Middle East.

- (j) Yes, 37 percent.
- (k) No, 28 percent.
- (l) Can't answer, 35 percent.

Because of our commitments and strategic interests (Israel, Turkey, Iran, Baghdad Pact, oil, military bases, etc.) the United States cannot avoid an active role in the politics of the area.

- (m) Yes, 63 percent.
- (n) No, 16 percent.
- (o) Can't answer, 21 percent.

2. On which (if any) of the following principles should the United States base its policies toward communism in the Middle East? If you cannot answer "yes" or "no," are uncertain or feel you have insufficient information, check the "can't answer" box:

Supply military and/or economic assistance to any Middle Eastern government which is threatened by aggression from international communism and which requests such assistance (Eisenhower doctrine).

- (a) Yes, 71 percent.
- (b) No, 12 percent.
- (c) Can't answer, 17 percent.

Provide military and/or economic assistance to any Middle Eastern government which is threatened, if the threat comes in part from the outside ("indirect aggression") and if help is requested (as in Lebanon).

- (d) Yes, 58 percent.
- (e) No, 15 percent.
- (f) Can't answer, 27 percent.

Take no military action in what are purely conflicts between Arab governments or between factions within Arab countries.

- (g) Yes, 68 percent.
- (h) No, 11 percent.
- (i) Can't answer, 13 percent.

Recognize the Soviet Union's legitimate interest in affairs on its own borders.

- (j) Yes, 79 percent.
- (k) No, 5 percent.
- (l) Can't answer, 11 percent.

Try to neutralize Soviet influence in the Middle East by working more effectively with new forces and new Arab leadership.

- (m) Yes, 81 percent.
- (n) No, 2 percent.
- (o) Can't answer, 11 percent.

Try to neutralize big power conflicts in the area by bringing the U.N. more into Middle Eastern affairs.

- (p) Yes, 90 percent.
- (q) No, 1 percent.
- (r) Can't answer, 3 percent.

#### Section II. Specific policy proposals for the Middle East

3. Which—if any—of the following policy proposals, now under discussion in Washington, would you be willing to support? (Check only those proposals you favor:)

(a) Try to restore normal pre-Suez relations with Nasser, including resumption of full economic aid program for Egypt, 43 percent.

(b) Try to work with any Arab leader who respects U.S. interests, 53 percent.

(c) Make no changes in present U.S. aid program in Middle East unless and until Arab States take the initiative in a regional development program, 23 percent.

(d) Participate financially in any Arab-sponsored development bank or institution that is set up on a sound basis, 67 percent.

(e) Continue U.S. aid and technical assistance programs country by country, 73 percent.

(f) Offer firm military guarantees to Israel to help defend its borders against possible Arab attack, 19 percent.

(g) Offer firm military guarantees to Jordan against possible attack from other Arab States, 16 percent.

(h) Attempt to reach agreement with the Soviet Union to band further arms shipments, from any sources, to the Middle East, 63 percent.

(i) Counteract anti-Western, anti-U.S. radio propaganda in the Middle East by expanding U.S. information activities, 77 percent.

(j) Press in the U.N. for an expanded permanent U.N. police force in the area to help keep peace on the borders and to monitor radio propaganda and other forms of "indirect aggression" against the independence of Arab States, 73 percent.

#### FACT SHEET NO. 5

##### OPINION BALLOT

#### Section I. Basic approaches to U.S. policy in Latin America

1. In U.S. global foreign policy Latin America should receive:

- (a) Higher priority than it has in the past, 75 percent.
- (b) Lower priority than in the past, 1 percent.
- (c) About the same priority as in the past, 9 percent.
- (d) Other, 5 percent.

2. The United States should adopt the following approaches to long-range economic, social, and political development in Latin America (check statements or choices you agree with, making sure your answers do not contradict each other):

(a) United States should approach Latin American development problems on a regional basis, 52 percent.

(b) United States should deal with Latin American problems on a country by country, rather than on a regional basis, 29 percent.

(c) United States should help solve the most urgent problems, as they crop up from year to year, 16 percent; or,

(d) United States should commit itself to long-term programs to help solve basic regional development problems, 68 percent.

(e) United States should feel free to intervene on the side of democratic forces trying to overthrow totalitarian governments, 16 percent; or,

(f) United States should keep hands off internal Latin American politics, 59 percent.

#### Section II. Specific U.S. policies toward Latin America

3. Which internal Latin American problems are important enough for the United States to act on? (Check problems which, in your opinion, call for U.S. assistance):

(a) Improving educational systems, 79 percent.

(b) Encouraging development of democratic governments, 56 percent.

(c) Speeding up internal economic development, 51 percent.

(d) Diversifying internal economic development, 59 percent.

(e) Controlling disease and providing better health and sanitation facilities, 61 percent.

(f) Promoting greater U.S. private investment in internal economies, 49 percent.

(g) None, 0.009 percent.

(h) Other, 7 percent.

4. Which (if any) of the following policy proposals, already under discussion in Washington, would you be willing to support? (Check those you agree with, making sure your answers do not contradict each other):

(a) Try to find long-range answers to the commodity price problem by joining with other surplus-producing nations in joint studies, 75 percent.

(b) Stabilize U.S. imports of Latin American basic commodities by guaranteeing purchases and stockpiling at U.S. expense when necessary, 13 percent.

(c) Restrict U.S. imports of Latin American commodities which might damage U.S.

producers (such as lead, zinc, oil, etc.), 12 percent.

(d) Protect U.S. producers with Federal subsidies, but avoid restrictions on basic imports from Latin America, 15 percent.

(e) Expand present U.S. economic and technical assistance programs in Latin America, 68 percent.

(f) Undertake a greatly expanded program of regional economic development involving long-term commitments and low-interest loans, 50 percent.

(g) Explore the possibilities of a regional (hemispheric) tariff and trade agreement to reduce trade barriers, stimulate regional trade, and stabilize prices, 63 percent.

(h) Reduce or discontinue U.S. military assistance to dictators, 67 percent.

(i) Give preferential treatment to democratic regimes in aid programs, 42 percent.

(j) Deemphasize Government aid and leave more of the job of Latin American economic development to private enterprise, 19 percent.

(k) Expand cultural and student exchange programs and encourage the study of Latin American languages and cultures in U.S. schools, 84 percent.

#### FACT SHEET NO. 6

#### Section I. Basic U.S. approaches to world economic problems

1. How can the United States deal realistically with the world economic revolution? (Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. If you are uncertain or feel you do not have enough information to answer "yes" or "no" check "can't answer":

United States needs to be concerned with economic development in only those countries which are important U.S. customers, or supply us with essential raw materials.

- (a) Yes, 7 percent.
- (b) No, 84 percent.
- (c) Can't answer, 4 percent.

Long-term U.S. economic growth requires a healthy and growing world economy.

- (d) Yes, 94 percent.
- (e) No, 1 percent.
- (f) Can't answer, 2 percent.

Economic growth in the rest of the world should be based on private and not Government investments.

- (g) Yes, 24 percent.
- (h) No, 43 percent.
- (i) Can't answer, 13 percent.

U.S. economy can afford a larger Government investment in economic growth of the rest of the world than we are now making.

- (j) Yes, 53 percent.
- (k) No, 22 percent.
- (l) Can't answer, 15 percent.

Reasonable U.S. trade policies and modest increases in foreign economic aid are not enough; a "crash" program is called for.

- (m) Yes, 26 percent.
- (n) No, 36 percent.
- (o) Can't answer, 24 percent.

#### Section II. Specific U.S. foreign economic policies

2. Which of the following policy proposals, now being debated in Washington, will you support? (Check only those proposals you favor):

(a) Expand U.S. economic aid program (loans and grants), 34 percent.

(b) Reduce foreign grants but expand long-term, low-interest loans, 59 percent.

(c) Expand U.S. technical assistance programs (skills and know-how), 89 percent.

(d) Channel more U.S. aid through U.N., 66 percent.

(e) Continue to give bulk of U.S. economic aid to underdeveloped allies, 34 percent.

(f) Place less emphasis on military aid to underdeveloped world, 75 percent.

(g) Take lead among industrialized democracies in a massive development program—economic and social—in non-Communist underdeveloped world, 69 percent.

(h) Through U.S. Government lending agencies, invest in more major public works in underdeveloped world (dams, irrigation, etc.), 67 percent.

(i) Take the lead in setting up regional development institutions in partnership with underdeveloped nations, 69 percent.

(j) Provide more U.S. scholarships to students from underdeveloped world, 79 percent.

(k) Encourage and provide incentives for more U.S. private investment overseas, 64 percent.

(l) Set up agency to coordinate U.S. Government and U.S. private investments overseas for maximum effectiveness, 59 percent.

(m) Make no major changes in current U.S. foreign aid programs, 5 percent.

(n) Insist that other industrialized nations pay larger share of the foreign aid burden, 31 percent.

(o) Take the lead in a worldwide reduction of tariffs, 54 percent.

(p) Join other surplus-producing nations (both developed and underdeveloped) in an effort to stabilize prices, prevent unfair competition, and promote new markets for such troublesome commodities as coffee, cotton, wheat, lead, tin, zinc, etc., 75 percent.

(q) Use U.S. economic power to compete with the Soviet Union in the foreign aid field; offer any non-Communist underdeveloped nation lower interest loans at better terms, on worthwhile development projects, 43 percent.

(r) Refuse U.S. aid to any nation receiving significant amounts of Soviet aid, 12 percent.

(s) Eliminate restrictions on U.S. trade with Communist powers, 20 percent.

#### FACT SHEET NO. 7

#### Section I. General approach to problems of the technological age

1. Which—if any—of the following principles should guide U.S. policies in the age of technology? (Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. If you are uncertain or feel you do not have enough information to answer "yes" or "no," check the "can't answer" box):

The military implications of modern technology are too complicated for ordinary citizens to understand; decisions in this area should be left to Government experts.

(a) Yes, 44 percent.

(b) No, 49 percent.

(c) Can't answer, 16 percent.

Under no circumstances should the United States permit the Communist nations to outdistance us in scope and quality of technology—either military or peaceful.

(d) Yes, 51 percent.

(e) No, 22 percent.

(f) Can't answer, 20 percent.

United States as a nation should invest more heavily in bringing the benefits of modern science and technology to our own citizens—medicine, transportation, power, etc.

(g) Yes, 72 percent.

(h) No, 16 percent.

(i) Can't answer, 8 percent.

United States should share its scientific and technological skills more extensively with the rest of the world and should try to benefit from the knowledge of other advanced nations.

(j) Yes, 96 percent.

(k) No, 5 percent.

(l) Can't answer, 2 percent.

There is a clear need for more information to be made available to and for more understanding by the general public of the problems and opportunities of the technological revolution.

(m) Yes, 96 percent.

(n) No, 1 percent.

(o) Can't answer, 1 percent.

#### Section II. Specific U.S. policies to deal with problems of the technological age

2. Which of the following policy proposals, now being debated, do you favor? (Check

only those proposals you are willing to support):

(a) United States should agree to a ban on testing nuclear weapons which cause a significant amount of radioactive fallout, without waiting for an enforceable control system, 39 percent.

(b) United States must continue some nuclear weapons research until an effective control system is installed, 67 percent.

(c) U.S. policymakers should give highest priority to plans for an effective nuclear test ban and arms control system, 67 percent.

(d) United States should not give up its atomic weapons under any circumstances, 27 percent.

United States should step up its peaceful atomic development at home through:

(e) Greater effort by Federal Government, 56 percent.

(f) Greater effort by private industry, 84 percent.

United States should make a greater contribution to peaceful atomic development in the rest of the world through:

(g) Direct negotiation with nations concerned, 22 percent.

(h) U.N. International Atomic Energy Agency, 30 percent.

United States should make every effort, including making more funds available, to insure the American educational system is equal to the Nation's needs, through:

(i) Increased Federal aid to public schools and universities, 65 percent.

(j) Public aid to private schools and universities, 25 percent.

(k) Greater State and community effort, 84 percent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, let me now summarize the case for this resolution.

#### THE CASE FOR AN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PLAN WITH UNITED NATIONS SUPPORT

First. The United States has been spending substantial sums to bring foreign students to these shores. This has done a great deal to build bonds of friendship between the United States and citizens of other countries. International educational centers cooperatively sponsored, internationally staffed, with an international student body, located in those regions of the world which do not now have adequate educational institutions, could similarly promote peace among the nations in these regions.

Second. The dollars we might spend to help underwrite a portion of the initial cost would be multiplied many times in the local and regional support for the program, and more people would be educated for the same number of dollars.

Third. Higher education ultimately depends upon an adequate base of elementary and secondary education. Teacher training institutions are vitally necessary to help build this base.

Fourth. The time is now ripe for the creation on an international or regional basis of teachers colleges, other colleges, universities, technical institutions, and graduate schools. The personnel who have been trained since the war offer a broad base of prospective faculty, and international institutions would attract competent faculty from other areas to help in the initiation and development of such schools.

Fifth. Unless international encouragement and support are given in the formative stages of the coming development,

we can expect nationalist systems to be developed in many small nations that may be professionally inadequate, and new seedbeds of strident and virulent nationalism will be planted. U.S. cooperation through the United Nations at this point may have a profound influence on the future of Africa, the Middle East, and Southern Asia. If we wait much longer, the opportunity may pass, never to come again.

Sixth. At present, United States loan agencies and United Nations lending agencies and technical assistance agencies are often operating in the dark, or at best in dim light, in many areas. Requests for project loans from across the earth come before committees of these organizations.

If they could secure the benefit of independent objective appraisal of priorities and significance from disinterested scholars and technicians living in and familiar with the regions directly concerned, the effectiveness of these programs would be multiplied many fold.

Moreover, conduct of scholarly research and education within these regions would lead to development of more significant and reasonable proposals. International educational institutions would thus offer tremendous help in the technical assistance and economic development program.

Moreover, they would provide a base of personnel trained in and familiar with the area to help in the carrying forward of these programs.

Seventh. Present methods of training students from underdeveloped areas is subject to certain significant criticisms. Some of the students sent abroad by their countries under cooperative programs become too enamored of the host country. As a result they seek to migrate to the host country, or they have a difficult problem of readjustment in their native country upon return.

Moreover, these students become attached to agencies headed by persons who may have lacked the overseas training. On-the-job tensions have been created because the staff appeared to know more than the boss.

Perhaps more of the leaders should be brought for training overseas in their special areas of interest, while more of the junior staff receive their technical training in regional schools closer to home. This would avoid some of the difficulties that have been observed.

Eighth. The United States is accumulating from appropriations made for other purposes large sums of foreign currencies in various parts of the world. Implementation of the program this resolution calls for would not necessarily require any new funds to be appropriated from the Treasury. Rather, we might spend currencies we own in a way which would do no harm, but great good for all concerned.

Ninth. The resolution proposes that the United States ask the United Nations to develop the detailed plan for an international education program. This way the host and contributing countries would all be a part of the planning operation. We would be planning with and not just planning for people. The plan



would be free from the taint of being "Made in America." Passage of this resolution through the Congress would be a great stimulus to the education of the peoples of the world. It would be evidence that we wish to work cooperatively and harmoniously in furthering the cause of international education and understanding.

We cannot expect peace to break out like the dawn of the morning sun rising against the eastern shore. But we can hope to build the edifice of peace brick by brick and block by block. Passage of this resolution should be a most significant addition to the edifice of peace.

In a world hungry for education, our positive offer to lend tangible aid to this noble purpose should prove of inestimable worth.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] on his really creative contribution to our foreign policy this afternoon.

A year or two ago when I was out with the International Cooperation Subcommittee in the Far East and particularly in Cambodia, one of the things that impressed me most was some of the very modest United Nations educational missions in which we happily participated, if only in a modest way.

I got the clear impression that if there is one thing for which the people of the underdeveloped regions really hunger and thirst it is the advancement of human endeavor and the beginnings of education.

As the gentleman has correctly said, these things come much more graciously if they have an international flavor to them. I think the gentleman's resolution is well thought out, and I hope it will attract the widest kind of support.

Again I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. I would note in passing that education is the one thing you can give away without losing. In sharing educational cooperation with other nations, we should also have much to learn.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I share the views just expressed. Certainly ideas are still the most powerful of all missiles. I am sure the resolution which has been introduced and the program the gentleman has outlined will go a long way toward helping us to reach a better understanding between countries.

It certainly would be instrumental in helping to reduce world tensions. It seems to me also it might help us to find other than H-bomb answers to the world conflict.

Mr. Speaker, as I have had previous occasion to say, it still seems apparent to me that ideas are the most potent of missiles. The combined blast and heat and radiation of a dozen H-bombs is not as devastating, nor as determinative of the history of humanity as is the light of one great idea. The Scripture from which we seek and receive inspiration

tells us, "You shall seek the truth and the truth shall make you free." How better can we seek the truth; how better serve the truth; how better spread the truth of the justice of our way of life than through a program such as the distinguished and able gentleman from Colorado has today suggested. How better can we use the counterpart funds which are available for such a program. These counterpart funds are now available. They are now put to a number of uses, some of which are not notably contributory to better international understanding.

Mr. Speaker, the absolute essential of any relaxation of international tensions and, which is even more immediate, the absolute essential of any continued international cooperation even among those nations now committed to the defense of freedom, is international understanding. Knowledge of what we stand for is our best source of support for our goals abroad. We have, in the past, sometimes demonstrated a positive genius for putting our worst face forward for the inspection of our potential friends. If the proposal originally sponsored by the gentleman from Colorado is adopted—a proposal, Mr. Speaker, which I am proud to cosponsor—we will have made measurable headway against the strong currents of mistrust and misunderstanding which now threaten to run our ship of state on the rocks of world disaster.

It is possible, as the gentleman from Colorado suggests, that this program might require an initial appropriation. It is equally possible that such a program might be fundable entirely from the existing counterpart funds available to us. In any event, Mr. Speaker, as an alternative to war, as a possible preventive action against the holocaust which we have the power to initiate, but not the power to survive, it is worth every cent it might cost. The cost of this program, Mr. Speaker, like the cost of every bit of the vast mutual security program, is a tiny fraction of the cost of world war III—a cost each of us will pay in terms of death—our own and our children's.

I share with the gentleman from Colorado the deep conviction that no wiser and no more beneficial use could be made of the counterpart funds than in this international education program. I congratulate the gentleman on his leadership in this respect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. COAD. As the gentleman from Colorado knows, I have joined with him in the introduction of this resolution. I wish to congratulate him on his presentation here and on his leadership in this very valuable and very worthwhile program.

I think it is certainly necessary in today's world that we extend not only our military might, but that we extend more importantly the might and power of ideas and ideals.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman also on his resolution, and I am very happy to have been able to join him in introducing this resolution. I think one of the most significant things in the day and times in which we are living is that much of our leadership fail to provide the kind of constructive and imaginative new ideas that the gentleman's resolution calls for.

It seems to me, too, that we have failed as a part of our national policy to make the greatest use of the machinery of the United Nations. In the proposals which the gentleman has outlined so well, it seems to me we would take advantage of the fact that this machinery does exist.

Because of the tensions that are so prevalent in the world today, if we are not imaginative enough to turn our thoughts, especially through the medium of education, to rally the people of the world and the forces of the world against the basic ideas of totalitarianism and behind the basic ideas of freedom and justice as they are exemplified in democracy, then in the end we must lose the fight.

I believe the fight can be won, and I believe the fight will be won if ideas such as the gentleman has expressed and brought forth here today can be implemented and dramatized in such a manner so that they will receive the support not only of our own people but the support of the vast majority of the still free people of the world. Again, I congratulate the gentleman with all my heart.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. From all that I have been able to observe, enthusiasm for this kind of thing around the world will be immediate and great. I am optimistic that this program has found its day, and that today is the day.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, my good friend, Mr. JOHNSON. A long time ago at my grandmother's knee, she told me that knowledge is the key to the universe.

I think the eloquent expressions that have been made here today prove our desire to help to make this a reality in many parts of the world. I am glad my distinguished friend has presented his resolution and I am happy to say I am one of those who is with him in this proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I welcome the gentleman as a cosponsor.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I, too, have joined in introducing this resolution.

I would like to emphasize a little more the point made by the gentleman from Oregon about the use of counterpart funds. Not so long ago I was talking with a representative of the Department of Agriculture who made no less than a trip around the world talking to the

leaders of the various countries, mostly underdeveloped countries, in regard to whether they might not carry on and find the needed scientists over there to carry out a supplemental program and pay these people with counterpart funds.

The gentleman's idea is to utilize the resources lying dormant and which are only good in the particular countries which have issued this particular money.

So I commend the gentleman for a most constructive effort, and I am happy to be joined in this effort with the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. Let me speak further about the question of the costs.

For example, it costs \$30,000 to \$35,000 to bring a foreign student to this country and maintain him through a 4-year college course and get him back home again. The same amount of money being spent overseas would probably finance 10 students.

More than that, the amount of money which I would envision Congress providing through counterpart funds would be only a fraction of the total amount which would be spent by the cooperating countries in such a program.

Therefore, whatever dollars we made available would be multiplied manifold as those countries gained interest in and enthusiasm for the program.

That is why I was so happy to see the SEATO communique, which confirmed what my friend told me to be the reaction in Southeast Asia. Not everyone graduated is an engineer, and we should be cooperating over a wider area.

This investment will simply be using part of the investment we have already made in acquiring counterpart funds.

We could not spend a hundred million dollars in this purpose in the next year if we wanted to. This program requires but a small amount of money, yet it is tremendously rich in its significance.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Colorado. I am wondering if it might not be possible to have some of the extravagance cut out in our foreign policy.

One of the things that comes to my mind is our development in foreign countries. Our diplomats are not able to speak the language of those countries. It seems to me if this program is in effect it might iron out some of those difficulties.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for his observations. There is no question but that if our lending and technical assistance agencies would have had faculties and a student body familiar with the areas where these programs operate, much of the waste now observed would have been eliminated. Necessarily, under the actual circumstances, there was much waste.

In the long run this program should certainly do much to help reduce that, and to render the programs far more effective. I am hopeful that we will be planting seeds which will bear much

fruit within the countries themselves, and that there will be less pressure upon us to provide funds.

Mr. GEORGE. May I say I am proud to join the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I want to join with those who are complimenting the gentleman for his distinguished contribution to the thinking of this Congress and the United States. I had the pleasure to cosponsor the resolution with him. I pointed out during the consideration of the Hawaii statehood matter that in the people of Hawaii we have had a competent resource, particularly in this field of which the gentleman is speaking, the educational field, and in the developing of an understanding which comes about by the mutuality of interests.

I was this morning advised, for example, that one of my constituents, Mr. James S. Miyake, had been appointed executive director of the National Educational Foundation in Bangkok for 1959.

The University of Hawaii has been a center through which many of these foreign students have graduated or have matriculated. In this connection I would like to point out that the distinguished, very able, and most knowledgeable Senate majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, on Friday gave a speech which touches upon the point raised by the gentleman today, and also points raised by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] in his speech earlier this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the speech referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

#### POSITIVE STEPS IN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON before the Women's National Press Club banquet for the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C., April 16, 1959)

Madam Chairman, Mr. Ambassador, distinguished editors, ladies and gentlemen, throughout our national experience, the month of April has been a month of history for Americans.

Our Congress met for the first time in April 180 years ago. General Washington was inaugurated as President in the same month.

Ninety-four years ago yesterday, Lincoln died here in Washington. And 14 years ago last Sunday, Franklin D. Roosevelt passed away at Warm Springs.

Our Civil War began in April 1861—and ended in April 1865. Fifty-two years later, in April of 1917, a man from the South, Woodrow Wilson, asked the United States to enter the war to make the world safe for democracy. And in April of 1945, men met at San Francisco to unite nations in the quest for world peace.

But of all our April anniversaries, the one which most directly affects our generation is the one which passes with the least notice. It comes next Wednesday when we enter the 13th year of the cold war.

It was on the 22d of April 1947 that the Senate approved legislation to implement the Truman doctrine. That was our official

recognition of the situation into which Soviet communism had plunged the world.

My assignment tonight is to speak on positive aspects of foreign policy. I am joined in this assignment by a man who has made as many positive contributions to a stable and free world as any other—Ambassador Carlos Romulo.

#### STRONGHOLDS OF FREEDOM

The cold war has been on our part essentially a defensive struggle. We are attempting to hold fast the strongholds of freedom against the aggressions of communism. In that sense, our position at times has seemed negative.

But it is impossible to discuss positive aspects—or any other aspects—of foreign policy today except against the background of the cold war. It is the compelling fact of our day.

Although our position has been defensive, it has been imaginative and bold.

#### INITIATIVE AND GOOD FAITH

We have shown initiative—as in the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, point 4, and NATO. We have displayed courage—as in Iran, the Berlin airlift, Korea, and Lebanon. We have exhibited good faith—as in our dealings with nations we could have held as colonies.

But to a great extent, our policies have been motivated by sheer reaction to the probing thrusts of Soviet communism into the free world. And because of that motivation, we have tended to forget what should be the true moral basis of our policy.

There has been a tendency to say that we send food to India because we want to win that nation over to our side.

There has been a disposition to say that we send technicians to southeast Asia because we want to halt the spread of communism.

#### IGNOBLE MOTIVES AND NOBLE DEEDS

There has been a readiness to exchange students with Europe because we wish to spread our ideas.

We have been ascribing ignoble motives to noble deeds. And in doing so, we have given the world the impression that we are bidding for friendship as traders bid for a sack of wheat.

Such an impression is an open invitation for those whose friendship we seek to shop around and see what the man on the other side of the street is willing to offer.

I think it is about time for us to change not our policy but our attitudes. I think it is about time for us to start proceeding on the assumption that we do things not because they are expedient but because they are right.

If we send food to India, we should do so because people are hungry and we have a surplus.

If we send technicians to southeast Asia, we should do so because people need help and we have the necessary skills.

If we exchange students with Europe, we should do so because we wish to exchange knowledge.

#### A HANDSHAKE, NOT A TIP

The world wants America to reach out its hand for a handshake, not to leave a tip. That is the kind of America we must be.

It is fashionable, in discussing foreign policy, to call for bold, new ideas. Such ideas are always welcome—although we must never confuse mere novelty with real merit. But I suspect our problems will be solved eventually by the vigorous and imaginative application of policies we already have in force. Some of them date back for many years.

In another April, 69 years ago, there was formed in this hemisphere the International Union of American Republics. Our Secre-



tary of State, addressing that convention, expressed our purposes this way:

"We believe that a spirit of justice, of common and equal interests between the American States, will leave no room for an artificial balance of power like unto that which has led to wars abroad and drenched Europe in blood."

This concept applies to our times and our challenges today.

#### JUSTICE AMONG NATIONS

We do not seek anything in this world other than justice among nations. We are not setting as our goal a precarious balance of power which will maintain not peace but a fearful and uneasy stalemate.

We must rest the alliance of freemen on a common interest in mankind's well-being rather than on the common bond of fear.

Our country will soon enter important conferences which may settle the destiny of the world. We are entering those conferences, unfortunately, without the services of a great and dedicated American who has borne the foreign policy burden for many years.

It is conceivable that those conferences will settle many problems. It is to be hoped that they will relax some of the tensions which now threaten to blow the world apart.

But even if those conferences should settle all questions of armaments, past treaties and boundaries—and as reasonable men we know this is doubtful—we should still be faced by a Communist challenge vital to our survival.

#### THE TWOFOLD CHALLENGE

The challenge is twofold: the economic challenge of trade and the moral challenge of understanding the people of the earth who remain outside the struggle of East and West.

Khrushchev has boasted that the Soviet Union will destroy us in economic competition. Khrushchev is no idle braggart.

And the Soviets have been working for years among the uncommitted people of the earth. It would be foolish to pretend that their work has not been effective.

To meet the challenge of trade will not be easy. It will require first exploration of the thinking of our fellow free nations to determine what steps can be taken to bring about economic unity.

To meet the challenge of human understanding, however, will be far more difficult than meeting the challenge of trade. For too many years, we have neglected the simple things that would break down the barriers between ourselves and the people who should be our friends.

#### LANGUAGE BARRIERS

For example, languages spoken by hundreds of millions of people all over the earth are hardly known in our land. The official languages of nations like the Union of South Africa, Korea, the Philippines, Pakistan, and others, are taught nowhere in the United States.

Our printing presses produce nothing that most of the world's population can read.

There are intellectual walls which must be broken down if we are to have mutual understanding. And there are ways of breaking down those walls.

Why don't we foster truly international centers of learning where the world's best and most mature minds can meet and exchange ideas?

We have the facilities; we have the scholars; we even have the sites.

We have recently taken an historic step in the development of our Nation. A group of mid-Pacific islands will soon share all the rights and responsibilities of the other 49 States in the Union.

The Hawaiian Islands lie astride the trade routes of the Pacific. Many of the people

have close ties to the countries of the Far East. They enjoy the advantages of a universality of stature and prestige.

#### AN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Why do we not establish in Hawaii an international university as a meeting place for the intellectuals of the East and the West?

Why do we not seek to attract scholars and students alike from both the Orient and the Occident?

Hawaii could be the place at which professors from Harvard, Chicago, California, and all our great universities could meet with the learned men of Tokyo, Manila, Indonesia, Southeast Asia, India, and Pakistan.

The great teachers of Asia could impart their learning to students from the West. And professors from the Western Hemisphere could lay before students of Asia the knowledge that has been gained in our part of the world.

In Hawaii, barriers of language would evaporate rapidly. People would gain new understanding and new respect for each other. And the intellectual association would benefit all mankind.

This is a concept which I have discussed many times with the distinguished and able Delegate from Hawaii, John Burns. It is a concept which we could put into actuality at a fraction of the cost of the weapons which we now ship to other nations of the world.

#### A PRACTICAL IDEA

That this is a practical idea has been demonstrated already by the University of Puerto Rico.

Under the American flag, and the wise leadership of Muñoz-Marin, the University of Puerto Rico has been building a bridge of understanding between us and the people of Latin America. A door to mutual understanding has been opened.

We have learned of the vital importance of the rich Spanish cultural heritage. And the Latin Americans have learned the truth about our hearts and our souls.

The University of Puerto Rico has been such a tremendous success that it has led the Senator from Montana, MIKE MANSFIELD, and the Senator from Florida, GEORGE SMATHERS, to propose a University of the Americas. And it is an idea which has great appeal.

Hawaii, a bright, new star in our flag, could also become a bridge spanning the Pacific.

We must not underestimate the importance of this bridge. The Communists long ago realized that the destiny of mankind could be settled in Asia. Leon Trotsky, the Bolshevik theoretician, said:

"The road to Paris and London might lead through Kabul, Calcutta, and Bombay."

#### COMMUNIST CONQUEST

The Communists exiled and assassinated Leon Trotsky. But they did not exile this idea. And one of the greatest single blows that has ever been dealt against the free world was the Communist conquest of 650 million Chinese—who are gaining at the rate of 13 million people a year.

Compared to the people of Asia, our population is a drop in the bucket. There are 400 million Indians increasing at the rate of 7 million a year. Eighty million people inhabit the Indonesian chain. When these are added to the millions of Japan, Korea, southeast Asia and the Middle East, totaling 1,500 million, this means our 175 million is a very small minority in this world.

#### THE CHALLENGE BEFORE US

For the challenges before us, we need both new ideas and old boldness. But our future lies not in the multiplicity of ideas but in singleness of purpose.

That singleness of purpose must be dedication to the concept that this can be a better and freer world for all the nations.

That is not a goal which can be achieved in one night or by one idea or even by one policy. But it is a goal which is attainable if America assumes not just the political and military but the moral leadership which should be ours.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman for allowing me this opportunity of presenting this speech of the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, and for contributing in a small way to the program he advocates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. Certainly an International Educational Institution in Hawaii would be a wonderful setting in which Asians could learn more about America under conditions which would make transition easier. I believe that could be done under the wording of my resolution, and it is thoroughly in keeping with the purpose.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I think they mutually support each other.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to include a copy of the concurrent resolution to which I referred:

Whereas the United States has benefited greatly from the exchange of students between our own country and other countries through the Fulbright Acts and Smith-Mundt Acts; and

Whereas the other nations of the world have in recent years experienced remarkable growth in the number of persons trained through the operations of these and similar programs; and

Whereas increasing the level of education and attainment of the peoples of the world is the most productive investment that the nations of the world can make for the well-being of all mankind; and

Whereas international educational programs enhance international understanding and thereby promote the cause of peace; and

Whereas the cause of peace can be served by increasing cooperation among peoples of other nations in the pursuit of educational attainment; and

Whereas many nations or regions of the world not now possessing universities, colleges, and technical institutes are now on the threshold of readiness to create and operate such universities, colleges, and technical institutes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the Congress of the United States hereby expresses its interest in encouraging the development of international educational programs, both graduate, including regional graduate schools, and undergraduate, including teachers colleges, technical institutes, as well as other colleges and universities; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Congress hereby recommends that the U.S. Government encourage the United Nations organization through its special fund or otherwise to undertake to develop a plan for international educational cooperation that would best serve the needs of the several member countries, as well as the cause of world peace and international economic and social development; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Congress hereby expresses its willingness to accept a reasonable share of the cost of bringing into operation certain aspects of such a plan through the use of foreign currencies available for these uses, or otherwise as may prove suitable and desirable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include the full text of a resolution and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks on this topic at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur heartily with the excellent presentation put forward in support of this bill by the able gentlemen who are cosponsoring this measure. I believe that they have shown effectively how this resolution can shore up America's participation in international cooperative educational plans and correct some of the flaws which have become apparent in the instrumentation of these otherwise praiseworthy ventures.

The establishment of the international education centers contemplated by this resolution would indeed keep students from underdeveloped countries from becoming "to enamoured of the host country," as my distinguished cosponsor, the gentleman from Colorado, so wisely put it. It also would be an effective force in uprooting the seeds of nationalism that all too often are planted in the universities of underprivileged countries which have contained their educational efforts to their own frontiers.

But while these benefits would accrue to America's favor in helping to remove the "Made in U.S.A." label from some of our cooperative plans, I would like to state that I seriously believe that another great benefit for Americans would evolve from the participation of our own students in this program.

For one thing, Americans training with foreign students under existing programs have always shared the burden—even as these foreign students have—of being either vastly in the majority or vastly in the minority. In our own schools, where foreign students comprise perhaps 3 percent of the student body, the American student has had little chance for ample contact, on both the informal academic and the social levels, that is so necessary for real understanding of our guests.

Conversely, when the American student ventures abroad to study, he finds the situation reversed—and perhaps even intensified by the aura of glamor—often coupled with distrust—which seems to surround the postwar American wherever he goes.

There certainly would be much to be said for a program such as would be provided by the fulfillment of this resolution. This program would export our innocents abroad, where they could participate as a small percentage of a student body that would consist of no

dominant national group. I believe that they would return matured by informal debate, hardened by coequal social contact, and much better prepared to advise their fellow Americans of the harsh realities in the world as it exists beyond our shores.

I feel that the implementation of the terms of this resolution would be of infinite benefit to our own students who venture into the rough-and-tumble of an international student body, as well as providing the many benefits which my worthy colleagues have mentioned before me.

#### HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have requested time today to discuss the vital question of home rule for the District of Columbia. Several distinguished Members of this House have made valuable comments on legislation to effectuate home rule for the District of Columbia on previous occasions. I have, myself, alluded to my own deep convictions in this matter and indicated my immediate interest in home rule on this floor earlier in the session. I wish to amplify my earlier remarks today.

Along with many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I am an attorney. As a lawyer, I am inclined to be interested in precedents when it comes to solving problems. I think it might be very helpful in considering home rule for Washington to look for a moment at the past. What has history indicated in this connection? What experience of the past can we draw upon in our deliberations on this problem today?

Along with others in this House, I have introduced legislation to provide home rule for the District. It would establish a territorial form of government for Washington. It is an agreed bill to the extent that it has broad bipartisan support and approval from the White House.

However, this proposal is conceived by some people as a radically new departure from established institutions. The fact is, of course, that it is not new. The District of Columbia enjoyed self-government until 1874, and for several of those early years operated under a territorial form of government not unlike the one proposed in the present legislation.

The historical facts may be well known, but they are worth reciting for purposes of refreshment and illustration. The establishment of a Federal district was provided for in the United States Constitution. In 1790 and 1791, the Congress passed acts establishing the District of Columbia, which at that time included area ceded by the States of Maryland and Virginia. Maryland ceded the incorporated town of Georgetown and portions of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties. The territory included in the Virginia cession in-

cluded the county and city of Alexandria.

The cession laws of Maryland and Virginia provided that the areas ceded should function under the respective State laws until Congress could set up a government. Finally, in 1802, Congress granted the city of Washington its first charter which incorporated the area and divided it into three wards. The structure of the government of Washington in that first charter included a council of 12 members elected annually by the qualified voters in the city. The elected 12 selected 5 from among them to serve as a second chamber. The mayor was appointed annually by the President of the United States. In 1804 the composition of both houses of the council was changed to nine, and was altered again in 1812 when provision was made for the election of the mayor by the council. In 1820 the charter of Washington was revised to require the biennial election of the mayor by the people, and the government of the city remained in substantially this form until the 1870's.

An instructive event took place with respect to the District in 1846. In that year, Congress received petitions urging the retrocession of the county and city of Alexandria to Virginia. The area ceded by Virginia had not been used by the Federal Government for public buildings up to that time. But more important, we are told, the Virginia populace felt prejudiced in that they had been disenfranchised except for local suffrage. Thus, late in 1846 Congress gave Alexandria city and county back to Virginia.

On February 21, 1871, Congress reorganized the government of the District of Columbia. It established institutions similar to those provided for U.S. territories. The entire District was created a municipal corporation, and executive authority was vested in a Governor appointed by the President. Legislative power was vested in a legislative assembly composed of a council and a house of delegates, the council appointed by the President and the house of delegates elected by the people. The Governor had the veto power, which could be overridden by a two-thirds vote of the assembly. The legislative assembly had a broad grant of power to deal with matters in the District, but all acts of the assembly were at all times subject to repeal or modification by the Congress of the United States.

The territorial government established for the District of Columbia barely had a chance to breathe life before it was struck down by its enemies. The Board of Public Works established in the act providing for a territorial form of government came under heavy criticism, and financial difficulties as a result of the panic of 1873 gave opponents of the new government an opportunity to bury it.

The law of 1871 provided for a delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives. For 4 years Washington citizens had their own elected Representative to the United States Congress. His name was Norton P. Chipman. Though his service in these hallowed Halls was short, Norton



Chipman served his District well at a time when it was under severe attack. His classic defense of territorial government in the District of Columbia is to be found in the official records of the 42d Congress of the United States. He took the floor of this House on May 27, 1872, to defend free government in his city. He opened his remarks by saying that—

The relation of the District toward the National Government has not changed; in no one particular is the national property affected by it. Congress retains the power to annul any of the acts of our legislature, or to wipe out the local government utterly, as it did in abolishing the charters of our cities in establishing the new government.

Not a foot of the national property is subject to taxation or placed under the slightest control of the local government, except that the control of the streets and avenues was by the act turned over to the Board of Public Works as the agent of the National Government. Instead of going to Congress, as we heretofore did, for general legislation of a local character, Congress relieved itself by creating a Legislative Assembly with delegated powers, and authorized it to create such officers and pass such laws, with certain exceptions, as were necessary to operate the new government.

Congressional opponents of the new government for Washington were severely critical of the Board of Public Works, and claimed that the new government was opposed by a thousand citizens. Norton Chipman, in his pungent and flowing oratorical style, defended the city against these critics. Let me illustrate from his speech the character of his defense:

Our organic act became a law in February 1871, and early in March the Governor, Board of Public Works, and other appointive officers were qualified. They began at once to organize the new government, so that at the expiration of the old charter, which by the act was to take place on the 1st of June, there should be no interregnum and no lack of power to carry on the necessary functions of the new government. \* \* \* Meanwhile the Board of Public Works was devising a plan of improvements embracing the whole District of Columbia. \* \* \* The plans were completed and the general outline approved by members of the advisory board. They involved an expenditure of about \$6 million, one-third of which being paid by the property abutting on the streets, left \$4 million to be raised by the legislature.

Immediately upon the organization of the legislature the Governor sent in a message to that body submitting the plans and suggesting a loan of \$4 million by creating a bonded debt to run for 20 years payable by a sinking fund. This bold innovation upon the old-fashioned way of raising money from year to year, and expending it without plan or purpose, startled the "one thousand citizens," who, according to my colleague, embody all the wisdom and virtue the District possesses, and they organized to put down this reckless encroachment upon ancient custom and upon this annihilation of the delights of foggyism.

The effort to defeat the legislation was unsuccessful, but the "one thousand" were able to get work on the public improvements stopped by means of a court order.

The legislature, not disposed to surrender the rights and interests of 130,000 citizens to the whims and prejudices of 1,000, passed another four million loan act to be submitted to the people. This passed August 19, 1871. \* \* \*

Then began one of the most relentless and bitter attacks that ever disgraced a community. These 1,000; aping New York and thereby seeking also to throw around the canvass the infamy of the New York Tammany ring, organized a committee of 70. Some respectable names were put forward as officers of the Citizens Association, and other decent people consented to go on the committee of 70, but the dirty, disgraceful work was performed by men who had neither social, business, nor official standing in the community.

A libelous sheet was started called the Citizen, and was supported by the money of persons who had not the courage to be responsible for its management. Every issue of the paper was full of abuse \* \* \* but its editor was wholly irresponsible, and as exempt from suit as any other sewer pipe in the city. If he had been a heap of dung he could not have been more pestiferous.

The result was that when the vote came the 1,000 citizens and a few recruits making 1,213 voted against the loan, and 14,760 voted for it.

But the opponents of the city's financial policies continued working against the policies of the new government, and, according to Norton Chipman, succeeded in seriously undermining the credit of city bonds.

These 1,000 citizens, having lost a free election, petitioned the Congress. A subsequent congressional investigation was unfavorable, and, finally, in 1874, Congress abolished the territorial form of government for the District of Columbia and substituted rule by three Commissioners appointed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I have recited these historical facts to show that the efforts to establish home rule for the District of Columbia under our bill is nothing more than to re-create the form of government which Norton Chipman defended so eloquently on May 27, 1872. Nearly a million people live in the 69 square miles of Washington, the Capital of a Nation which has consistently reaffirmed its belief in the principle of self-government.

We have lately conferred first-class citizenship upon our brothers in Alaska and Hawaii. Yet at our very doorstep a million of our people are still second-class citizens. We can do no less than to give them the franchise, and to permit them to manage their purely local affairs through their own representatives.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is instructive to note that Senator HARTKE, the new chairman of the Senate District Judiciary Subcommittee, took little more than 3 months from the day Congress convened to begin Senate hearings on home rule for Washington, D.C. They began on April 15.

But we have yet to hear a similar announcement from the District of Columbia Committee in this body, although there are at least 24 home-rule bills before it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, our committee has failed to report a bill on any of the four occasions in the last 10 years when Senate-approved bills were referred to it.

There may be a good deal to say for due deliberation, Mr. Speaker, but by

the same token there is a good deal to be said against deliberate delay—which seems to be the situation when it comes to home rule for the District. This delay deliberately ignores the wishes of the 24 home rule bill sponsors; it ignores the District Commissioners who emphasized their support for home rule by placing it first on their list of 34 legislative proposals to the 86th Congress in their annual state of District message; it ignores the great majority of our American people who feel that the people of Washington have every right to govern themselves; and, of course, it ignores the platforms of both major political parties.

While we continue to delay, Mr. Speaker, we must recognize the consequences of our failure to leave the business of running the municipal government to the residents, property owners, and taxpayers of the District of Columbia—the city's true body politic. Without a doubt one serious consequence is that the National Government becomes responsible for doing the local work of the District government.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I am very happy to hear the gentlewoman's last comment. I was elected to Congress in 1948. When I came here I did not anticipate that I would be acting as alderman for the city of Washington, but that is what happened to me. I have been on the Committee on the District of Columbia for 4 years. I know every Member of Congress ought to know that those of us who serve on the District Committee have many more important responsibilities here in the Congress than trying to administer the minor affairs of the District of Columbia in every legislative field. I do not believe I was sent here to spend half a morning on school board affairs, police affairs, public works affairs, and so forth. So I join with the gentleman from Maryland and the gentlewoman from New Jersey in hoping that I will live long enough so that someday I shall see the House Committee on the District of Columbia report out some type of home-rule bill for the District.

Mrs. DWYER. I thank the gentleman. I was just ready to develop what the gentleman had to say.

It's a job we did not campaign for, Mr. Speaker, but the fact remains that every time we win election to Congress we also win a second victory—a seat on the "city council" of Washington, D.C.

This is no little job. The Legislative Reference Service estimated that it takes Congress "some 6,000 man-hours of time and \$2 million per session" to manage District affairs.

In the course of 6,000 hours of council meetings this session, Mr. Speaker, we shall have to decide whether "meter-maids" are the answer to parking-meter problems. And we must weigh the advantages of adding \$4,000 worth of fender piling at the end of pier No. 5—which, by way of identification, is now being used by the city fireboat.

When we have those matters settled, we must consider the problem of a defective heating system at the morgue, and the question of how much money to spend for Watergate concerts next year. In addition, Appropriation Committee hearings contain 1,000 more pages of other details in city administration—details that the people of Pittsburgh, Boise, Atlanta, Elizabeth, N.J., and every other American city, except Washington, take care of for themselves.

Home rule would go a long way toward restoring true city government and self-determination to the people of Washington, and it would throw all of us out of a city council seat we have no business holding in the first place.

We have had 10 years and more of due deliberation, Mr. Speaker. Let us not delay any longer. Let us act on home rule now.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. It is a pleasure to join in this discussion and I commend both the gentleman from Maryland and the gentlewoman from New Jersey on their very pointed and persuasive remarks. I can heartily say with the great majority of our colleagues here that we have been elected to the House, and that is the important thing.

Mr. Speaker, before I make my own brief remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS] may extend his remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to join with the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY], in his endeavor on behalf of the restoration of self-government for the people of the District of Columbia. I do not intend to speak on the merits of any particular legislation. I do want, on behalf of my constituents who have been so recently so fairly treated by the American people and their representatives, the 86th Congress, to express the support of Hawaii of the legitimate aspirations of fellow Americans for the right to run their own affairs.

Writing of his investigation into the American Revolution, Alexis de Toqueville said:

Municipal institutions constitute the strength of free nations. A nation may establish a system of free government but without municipal institutions it cannot have the spirit of liberty.

An essential element of the American way of life has been the spirit of liberty which has manifested itself in so many ways to the benefit of our social, economic, and political institutions. Americans must preserve this spirit of liberty they are most fortunate to enjoy as a result of the vision and practical effort of their forefathers.

Our recognition of its source should strengthen our determination to examine and reexamine our institutions to make certain that we maintain and develop the

forms of government by which it is developed. This calls for self-government at the level of peoples' living together in a community. With this in mind, reasonable men can agree on legislation by which this purpose can be accomplished.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the argument for home rule for the District of Columbia is so overpowering that there really is no answer. Indeed, I consider it significant that those, whoever they may be on either side of the aisle who are opposed to home rule, are not here to participate in this discussion today.

Certainly, the 85th Congress and its successor the 86th Congress, which is now in session, have shown remarkable concern for the rights of self-government for citizens of our great Nation. The fact that we did act, after a period of over 40 years to enlarge the Union from 48 States to 49 States and now again we have brought in not only another State, but an area which is more than 2,000 miles from the mainland of this continent, indicates a broadening interest and concern in the Congress and in the country in the right of people to work out their own destiny. Yet, ironically, it is here at the very seat of government and in the very shadow of the Capitol that we do not permit self-government. As one who has spent many, many hours not in considering the minor affairs of the Capital, but in studying the subject of American education and of the things to be done, it has been my experience in the past that every time we come to the floor with an education bill, the cry is raised about Federal control of schools. Well, it flabbergasted me to find out within the past week how the school board of the District of Columbia is constituted and how the members of the school board get office. Since we have not given these nearly a million people the right to elect a school board, the way they do in every other community in the United States, how then is their school board selected? This is very fascinating when you consider the way the cry of Federal control and Federal dictation of schools goes up. They are appointed by the Federal judges.

This is a very anomalous situation—and I am not saying the Federal judges have not done a pretty good job because I think the school board's record is good. It is astounding to think that in the United States of America today something that is as close to the people as a school board which makes school policy, appoints schoolteachers and school administrators, and makes determinations on important matters with regard to the education of the young, that this is dictated—and I do not think that any other word is quite appropriate because we have reposed the authority there—and the authority to select school board members resides strictly in Federal hands. So this Federal control of schools, which so many people are concerned about when it comes to aid-to-education legislation apparently does not concern them at all, when it comes down to the problem of the schools of the people who live within a stone's throw of the Capitol.

Therefore, it seems to me the time has come, if we really believe in States' rights—which properly defined is local self-government really—and if we really believe in the basic, democratic idea that people at every level of society shall have, insofar as is possible, the right to work out their own will and their own destiny—then the time has come to grant home rule to the District of Columbia.

Unless I mistake the temper of the House and the temper of this Congress, I think that this Congress will put another feather in its cap in addition to the one we have for our action with regard to Hawaii and that we will—I hope before this session is concluded—see home rule granted to the District of Columbia.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Maryland, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, and the gentleman from California on their remarks on this all-important subject. I am not a member of the District of Columbia Committee, yet I have followed this subject more or less closely for some years in the past.

Prior to the time I came to Congress I was a resident of the District of Columbia in a different capacity. I wondered at that time why it was that citizens of this District were denied the power and the right and authority to take care of their own housekeeping problems. I continue to wonder why. Now, as a Member of Congress I assume it my privilege to at least say a few words which I hope will do something to encourage the leadership of the House to see to it that this measure is brought to the floor for debate.

This is the fifth time in 10 years that a Senate-passed bill to provide home rule for the District has been before us, and yet in all this time the House has not had an opportunity to debate or vote on the issue. Surely, it seems to me, 10 years is long enough to keep this measure from coming to the floor. There have not been any hearings on this side of Capitol Hill on home rule during all this period. It is very likely that there are votes in the membership sufficient to pass this measure on the floor. I cannot be sure, because we never have had a chance to vote on it, but certainly there is a majority that believes in democratic principles, and that home rule should at least have a hearing and a vote. The basic issue is whether this body is master of its own house.

I do not think this home rule question should be left unanswered any longer. We should have an opportunity to have a hearing and discuss it and have fair debate on the floor within the very near future. The wishes of the people of this community for home rule have been stultified for many years. No one as yet has been able to persuade me that there is any reason why we should not have complete confidence in the capacity of these people to deal autonomously with strictly local matters, primarily affecting their own community.



Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am happy to join in cosponsoring a bill for home rule, and I welcome the remarks which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] has made.

Some years ago I was a resident of the District of Columbia and I have some sympathy in the wishes of the voteless residents who live here. Now I live in a suburban area and I find myself on the city council of this city, and that seems an anomalous situation.

Certainly the people here may think we are not disposed to consider this proposition. If the Congress can complete the job, as we have done with Hawaii and Alaska, and can demonstrate that we can plead in both Houses for home rule for the District of Columbia, then we should be a little more proud to be Members of Congress.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in complimenting the gentleman from Maryland, who has just spoken in favor of a home rule bill for the District of Columbia. When I first became a Member of Congress in 1950 I found that this was a problem that had confronted the country for many years before. It interested me to the extent that I introduced a bill at that time providing for a measure of home rule for the people of Washington. It seems to me that a hydrogen bomb or atomic weapon is something of a holding weapon. We are not doing anything at all to capture the minds of the people of the free world or the world behind the iron curtain. We handicap ourselves immeasurably, for it is known throughout the world that we do not have enough confidence in our own people to give the franchise to those who live in our Capital City. It is a national disgrace that this privilege has not been granted up to now.

The votes on the Alaskan statehood and the Hawaii statehood bill, as has been very ably pointed out by two of the previous speakers, seem to indicate a growing up for the United States and for its people in the Congress. The bills as they were debated in the Congress during the present session, it seems to me, were debated without bias, without prejudice and the rancor and feeling that had taken place in previous years, which indicates that there is a growing understanding and a better understanding of our problems and what should be done with respect to our own people.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me about time that the forces of moderation and compromise gain some voice in this House on the issue of home rule for the District of Columbia.

Now we have a bill before us that represents a conscientious and generous attempt to find a moderate, middle ground solution to this problem, one that concedes as much to any legitimate ob-

jection as can be conceded and still make some progress on this problem. Many of those who support the Multer-Springer Bill, as introduced by members of the District Committee and many other members of both parties, have made a sacrifice of their own preferences to do so. Many would prefer a bill that went much farther in granting suffrage to the District.

In spite of their feelings, these Members of the House have endorsed this legislation as a middle-ground measure which attempts to meet reasonable fears and objections. They are willing to engage in the kind of conciliation that is necessary in a democratic system. But they expect opponents to be reasonable, too.

This bill has every possible protection of the national interest and of Congress' power to supervise the government of the District. It provides for a Governor nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate who obviously will have a strong sense of his responsibility to Congress and the Nation. It provides not one but two vetoes over the actions of the legislative assembly. The President can veto the actions of the local government. Congress itself, at any time, can veto the actions of the local government. Congress will continue to have the control and influence that goes with annual appropriation of the Federal contribution to the District. And finally, it is obvious that if the local government is unsatisfactory, Congress can always undo what it has done and return to congressional government.

I hope that will never happen. With all the safeguards in this bill, I cannot conceive that it could be necessary. This is a far greater retention of control than is exercised over any State capital by the legislature, or over foreign capitals by their governments. Other cities flourish with far more local control—flourish, I am bound to say, a great deal better than the District does under congressional government.

What more can reasonable men ask? What possible real danger can be seen in such a system?

I think it is time that this House demonstrated its willingness to consider with an open mind the restoration of democracy to our Capital City. After these many years of delay, we are entitled to ask a reasonable opportunity to debate and vote on this bill. There is no excuse for further delay in holding hearings on home rule legislation and I think we should get on with it. Let's have some hearings on this matter now.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been watching with interest the game being played in this House on the subject of self-government for the District of Columbia. The cynical observer of our political system might find it amusing. I do not and I do not think many Americans do. Most Ameri-

cans respect our system of government. They believe in majority rule under the Constitution. They believe that committees of this House are its agents, not its masters. So they cannot find this game very amusing.

Control of the committees, the procedure and the policy of this House supposedly rests with the majority and the opposition party is in the majority. They, like the Republican Party, supposedly endorse home rule for the District. But in fact, control, procedure and policy on this issue apparently do not rest with the majority.

The game is a simple one. Supposedly, both parties are committed to home rule for the District of Columbia. But nothing ever happens. I believe a majority of the House wants to enact home rule.

And so, while the majority party that is supposed to control the House sits back and submits, we see the same old game. Year after year, there are the same vague reports of hearings to be held on home rule—maybe—sometime. We Republicans cannot compel action. But we are prepared to honor our party's pledge and our President's recommendation and to pass home rule.

It is really up to the Democrats. They have control of the House, not we. They control the committees, appoint the committee chairmen. If their party pledge is to be honored, they will have to take the steps to do so.

Mr. Speaker, home rule has been solemnly endorsed as part of the official program of both parties. A large number of members of both parties want a chance to enact this legislation. Many Members, including members of the District Committee, have sponsored the bill and have asked for early hearings. The Senate is about to give its approval to home rule for the fifth time in 10 years. Is it going to die in this House again, without hearings or consideration, for the fifth time in 10 years, in spite of the desire of many members that, at least, it have its day in court?

I put the question squarely to the majority party in this House, which has the authority and the responsibility to answer these questions. Are we going to get prompt hearings? Are we going to have a chance to vote on this bill?

I will await with interest the outcome of this game.

I do know that the issue has been stalled, evaded, obscured and just plain blocked, year after year. We hear the same old mock-solemn worries about constitutionality, even though home rule has been proved constitutional by everyone from the Founding Fathers to the present Supreme Court. The same old talk about more urgent and more important legislation to be considered first. The same old talk about the serious legislative problems to be solved—although the Senate has solved them time after time and no one can tell us what they are. Just why is it that problems that do not exist on the other side of the Capitol suddenly appear when the bills get over here?

I am no prophet, but it is easy to predict where the game goes from here. The chairman of the committee says there will be hearings—but not for a

while yet. The subcommittee chairman has not heard that he is going to hold hearings—he has not made any plans and he has other bills scheduled. So the buckpassing and the stalling go on. Hearings will be put off as long as possible. Maybe, eventually, we will get a day or two of perfunctory hearings when it is too late to do anything about it. Then, if the managers of the game have their way, the thing will die there. I challenge anyone to dispute this statement—as history, as present fact, or as prediction.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be proven a poor prophet on this issue. I would like to believe that those few who are in the saddle on this issue are not going to play this cynical game again this year. But there is nothing I or my party can do about it. The Republicans do not control this House or its committees.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks on the subject just discussed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] for bringing to the attention of the House the matter of self-government for the District of Columbia. In so doing he has rendered a service to his country the more significant because at a time when we are seeking the friendship of peoples in awakening lands who desire for themselves the right of self-determination it is difficult for them to understand why in the United States we deny the exercise of the right of self-determination to our fellow Americans who live closest to our National Capitol. I have supported home rule for the District of Columbia in all the Congresses of which I have been a Member. I confidently expect that from the 86th Congress will come the legislation that so long has been demanded by every rule of decency and every precept of democracy. But we cannot be halted by a roadblock.

Those who have seemed determined to deny this House an opportunity to consider self-government for the District have told us that the Nation's Capital is too important to turn over to local control. They tell us the national interest demands the careful, wise guidance of Congress, with its national point-of-view.

This is an argument that has no basis in reality. In the first place, nobody wants Congress to give up its power. Under the Constitution Congress must and will, with any form of government, retain ultimate control. It will have the final voice on policy. It will have all the power it needs to insure that the national capital is governed according to the national interest.

In the second place, self-government for the District will enable Congress to do a better job of supervision. Congress does not govern the District now. Two of its Committees do. Even they do not have the time to do the kind of

job they would wish. Frequently Members have to be drafted to serve and frequently they get off at the first opportunity. In the other body, one able member of the Committee quit this year and another who had served on the House District Committee served public notice that he would not go on the District Committee in the other body.

Congressional government of the District just does not interest the members of Congress. When the District appropriations bill was on the floor recently, only 28 members found the time and had the interest to show up to vote. In contrast, when there was threatened a bad financial mess, hundreds of local citizens turned out for hearings on the appropriations bill in the Committee of the other body. They filled every chair and overflowed a large hearing room. That is the kind of public interest that is necessary for the efficient functioning of representative government.

We have waited long enough—too long. Sentiment in this House overwhelmingly supports prompt hearings and action on home rule legislation. I join respectfully but emphatically with the many Members who are requesting the District Committee to act without further delay.

#### "WASHINGTON WINDOW"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Cordele Dispatch, a daily newspaper published at Cordele, Ga., in its edition of April 15, 1959, page 8, has an article entitled "Washington Window," by Lyle C. Wilson, United Press International, and the following was contained therein:

#### THE POLITICAL UNDERTOW

U.S. Communists are ballyhooing a Youth March on Washington timed for next Saturday, April 18. It will be a propaganda protest march in behalf of further Federal action on civil rights for Negroes. The demonstrators will march by bus from cities as distant as Chicago, according to the Sunday Worker, publication of the Communist Party, U.S.A. The marchers probably will peacefully picket the White House, a well tested propaganda tactic. A delegation will seek audience with President Eisenhower and fail, a sure fire publicity gimmick.

The information from "Washington Window" being of interest to me, I asked the Library of Congress to furnish me with the Sunday Worker, publications of the Communist Party, U.S.A., for April, and the Sunday, April 5, 1959, issue carried on page 2 thereof the following:

#### APRIL 18 YOUTH MARCH WIDENS CALL FOR RIGHTS

(By T. R. Bassett)

The April 18 youth march on Washington which started out as an action for speedy

integration of the schools has been broadened out to a march for the total victory of equal rights for all. The new call released by the march committee declared, "We won't take no for an answer."

In Chicago a spokesman for the local organizing body announced that 40,000 signatures on the petition to the President had been turned in to headquarters and another 40,000 had been collected but were not yet brought in.

Three hundred young people in Chicago have already announced they intend to participate in the march.

A. Philip Randolph, march chairman, said that 14 members of the Puerto Rican House of Representatives had signed the petition.

Randolph said the youth marchers will call upon all Americans to join in a great campaign for civil rights legislation covering every aspect of life, including unemployment and housing as well as education.

He saw the action as the beginning of a national crusade demanding the passage by Congress of the Douglas-Celler-Javits-Powell civil rights bill. He termed the measures submitted by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and the White House totally inadequate.

He attacked conditional agreements with Dixiecrats and Dixiecrat inspired civil rights legislation.

An estimated 20,000 marchers, Negro and white, will converge on Washington April 18.

Randolph predicted that the signatures collected will be more than doubled.

The White House, leaders of the youth march said last week, had assured them by letter that the President would meet a representative delegation of Negro and white students who will present the petitions. During a similar march last October 25, a youth delegation was rebuffed at the White House gates.

The special statement issued last week said in part:

"We march—

"For the traditional rights of free speech, of suffrage, of due process, of equal protection under the law.

"In protest against these vicious attacks [on the Supreme Court] and call upon these executive and legislative branches to back up the Supreme Court.

"To pass the Douglas-Celler-Javits-Powell bill.

"To protest minority rule in Congress.

"To confront the President directly with the conviction of young people that he must use all of his powers to bring about the speedy integration of the schools.

"To demand for every American, every single right guaranteed by the Constitution, political, civil, and social.

A rally of youth is scheduled by the Chicago sponsoring committee on Sunday, April 11, 2 to 6 p.m., at the Packing Center, 4859 South Wabash.

Petitions have been circulated in Hyde Park, Du Sable, and Dunbar High Schools, and the committee is awaiting permission from the board of education to circulate them throughout the school system. Individual supporters of the march report excellent response from Negro and white students as well as teachers to request all signatures.

Delegations from the University of Chicago, Roosevelt University, Wheaton College, and Chicago Teachers College are already organized, it was announced.

Steel union locals, dining car employees, sleeping car porters, packing, auto, and retail clerks union locals, as well as many churches have given support to the march.

Detroit: The reports here are that two busloads of Detroit youth are going to Washington April 18.

Carrying a coffin with the slogan "Segregation must die too," the Negro and white youth staged a "drum up" march last Saturday for the April 18 event.



The young marchers walked slowly from Grand Circus Park down Woodland Avenue, the city's main thoroughfare to city hall and from there to the Detroit Board of Education to protest segregation in Detroit schools.

A preparations committee of more than 50 youth, Negro and white, meets Monday nights at the Peoples Church, Woodward at Pingree Avenue where petitions are turned in.

Berkeley, Calif.: A bay area committee has been formed to support the April youth march. Among sponsors are labor leaders, entertainers, ministers, educators, and leaders in the Negro community.

The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, April 15, 1959, issue, page B-7, carried the following article:

#### FIFTEEN THOUSAND TO MARCH TO PROMOTE LAWS FOR INTEGRATION

More than 15,000 white and colored persons will meet here Saturday on behalf of school integration and civil rights legislation.

The group has scheduled a march from Seventh Street and Madison Drive on the Mall to the Washington Monument and then south to the Sylvan Theater. The march is to begin at 2 p.m. Saturday and the mass meeting at the theater is scheduled from 3:15 to 5 p.m.

Citations for contributions to the cause of integration will be presented to Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution; Mrs. Daisy Bates, the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jackie Robinson, Harry Golden, Harry Belafonte, Lillian Smith, Sidney Poitier, Roy Wilkins and the Rev. Gardner Taylor.

The 1959 Youth March for Integrated Schools will bring petitions here, signed by citizens throughout the country, calling for "speedy integration of schools throughout the United States."

The march was initiated at a meeting of more than 10,000 young people here last October 25. It will signal the beginning of a national campaign for immediate school integration and the passage of the Douglas civil rights bill.

The Albany Herald, daily newspaper published in Albany, Ga., April 17, 1959, issue, carried a UPI story as follows:

#### NAACP TO HOLD YOUTH RALLY IN WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON.—The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will hold its annual youth rally here Saturday with 15,000 to 20,000 youngsters expected to participate.

The NAACP said delegates would march from their downtown headquarters to a theater for a mass meeting. Speakers will include the Rev. Martin Luther King, leader of a civil rights movement at Montgomery, Ala., and LeRoy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary.

Of course, the Saturday referred to in the last quoted article was April 18, and the rally referred to therein was undoubtedly the same rally referred to in the Sunday Worker.

In the article of April 15 appearing in the Washington Evening Star, the name of Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, led all of the rest of the persons to receive a citation for contributions to the cause of integration, even ahead of Rev. Martin Luther King, Daisy Bates and Jackie Robinson.

Down in Georgia, Mr. McGill has vigorously denied doing anything to contribute to the cause of integration. Nevertheless, many in Georgia believe that Mr. McGill is and has been an inte-

grationist and believes that the group knew what they were doing when they decided he should have a citation.

#### SMALL BUSINESS TAX REFORM AND REVISION

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. MOORE, of West Virginia, Mr. AVERY, of Kansas, Mr. SMITH, of California, Mr. ROBISON, of New York, Mr. QUIE, of Minnesota, and I, members of the House Small Business Committee, have introduced identical small business tax reform bills.

Our present small tax reform bill contains provisions which were included in legislation which we introduced on March 6, 1957, in the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

Our previous bill contained 11 reform adjustments amending the Internal Revenue Code, 3 of which were enacted by the 85th Congress. Therefore, our present bill includes proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code not previously enacted, all in the interest of small business tax reform.

The three amendments referred to above were included in Public Law 866, 85th Congress, 2d session, and were as follows:

First. Allows investors who lose money in small-business ventures to write off their losses against ordinary income up to \$25,000 a year—\$50,000 in the case of a joint return by husband and wife.

Second. Allows small corporations with, say 10 or fewer stockholders the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships.

Third. Allows payment of estate taxes attributable to ownership in a closely held business over a period of 10 years.

Public Law 866 of the 85th Congress also made adjustments in the operating loss carryback and provided for an increase of the minimum accumulated earnings credit. In addition, Public Law 866 makes an allowance which increases first-year depreciation or credit on the first \$10,000 invested in depreciable tangible property, either new or used. In the case of a joint return of husband and wife the allowance is increased to \$20,000. Within the foregoing limitations, the amendment permits a 20-percent allowance in the year of acquisition, in addition to depreciating the remaining 80 percent under existing schedules.

Our bill—H.R. 562, and the following, of the 85th Congress—would have allowed rapid tax amortization over a 5-year period. As we pointed out at the time, smaller concerns received little benefit under the rapid amortization program during the World War II or the Korean war periods. However, since this program has declined in use, we are more in favor of measures which will permit funds to be plowed back into the business.

#### TAX REFORM AND REVISION FOR SMALL BUSINESS IS NEEDED—NOT TAX RELIEF

The fundamental principle which motivates us in introducing tax legislation is reform and revision of certain sections of the Internal Revenue Code in the interest of small business. We do not and cannot conceive lasting benefit from mere tax relief. We do not even like the term "tax relief." Small business is not a mendicant but represents the broad base on which our entire business economy rests. The latent strength of our small business economy of today is the assurance of a vigorous and healthy business economy in the tomorrows to come.

Unless we are willing to face up to the responsibility of providing the means by which our small business institutions may grow and expand on a sound, constructive basis, we will reach these tomorrows with a faltering business structure. This, our enemies, current and potential, desires above all else. A strong America is the keystone of a free world.

#### GROWTH, EXPANSION, AND MODERNIZATION

In the bill which we introduced on March 7, 1957, the emphasis was placed on the ability of small business to plow back earnings into the business for growth, expansion and modernization. Section 2 of that bill and section 2 of our present bill would permit small business concerns to deduct against ordinary income up to a total of \$33,500 for the expansion or modernization of small business facilities.

Many bills have been introduced incorporating this principle since the introduction of our bill in the early days of the 85th Congress. The most popular limitation seems to be \$30,000. We do not quarrel with this or any similar figure so long as the basic principle is maintained in any legislation which in the future may be enacted.

Our bill incorporates an allowable deduction at different taxable income levels up to a maximum taxable income of \$150,000. This is because it is our conviction that the greatest incentives should be provided at the lower taxable income levels. The smaller the concern the greater the difficulty in finding a way to plow back earnings into the business. Moreover, the smaller the earnings may be in a business and assuming a sound, well managed business operation, the greater the difficulty in securing equity financing and long-term loans. Therefore, the only realistic solution and the most needed tax reform for small business is the ability to plow earnings directly back into the business. Small business cannot depend on tax relief or fringe benefits such as is included in Public Law 866 of the 85th Congress for either equity or working capital.

#### SMALL BUSINESS TAX POLICY

Credit and equity capital are necessary collateral requirements for business health and prosperity, but the ability of a business once established to plow back earnings is the one component which is absolutely necessary for a well balanced financial business structure. Unless we

can remove the impediments which prevent earnings from being plowed back into the business and which are basically responsible for the lack of credit and capital, for increased mergers, for many small business failures, impediments which retard small business growth and expansion, we shall have failed in our objectives.

In broadening the tax base by permitting small concerns adequate plow-back provisions our revenue would be increased in a relatively short period of time because of the earning capacity which would be added to our taxable structure. In a previous statement we made this point:

It is sometimes alleged that the loss of revenue, which immediate tax reductions might cause, would weaken the fiscal program of the Nation. We believe, however, that the encouragement of opportunity and expansion for small business, which carefully considered tax reform would bring about, would have beneficial ramifications throughout our economy. We believe the result would create sufficient new wealth through increased productivity and employment and that a generally broadened tax base would inevitably follow. Thus, in approving needed tax revision, we would be insulating our free enterprise system against the corrosive damage of this mobilization era and, at the same time, creating a climate for increased employment and productivity, which are the conditions essential to the functioning of our system of taxation and our fiscal policy.

Some of the points which should be included in any consideration of small business tax policy are:

First. Recognition of the importance of small and new businesses and a tax policy which encourages freedom of entry into business.

Second. Recognition of the necessity for a tax system which will stimulate incentive and provide growth and one which will not penalize either large or small firms.

Third. Recognition of the importance of a tax structure which has a minimum impact on the competitive relations of large and small firms. This is a necessary corollary to our free-enterprise system.

Fourth. Recognition that the tax problem is the basic financial problem of most well-managed small business concerns. One problem of small and medium sized concerns in financing is the inability to float equity issues or to borrow in the most fruitful money markets.

Fifth. Recognition that the inherent difficulty of small and medium sized business concerns in growth, expansion, and modernization is the inability to plow earnings back into the business.

Sixth. Recognition that product diversification enjoyed by larger concerns in the manufacturing and processing industries enables such concerns to grow at a pace which smaller concerns cannot match.

Earnings of small and medium sized concerns have a tendency to fluctuate more, year in and year out, than larger businesses. In a period of rising prosperity these concerns accelerate their profit take rapidly. In declining periods the descent to a break even or loss position is reached more quickly by most

small concerns, particularly in the field of manufacturing and processing. Therefore, adequate reserves can only be built up in rising markets and then only if the tax system will permit the accumulation of such reserves.

Neither large nor small business should be looked upon as tax targets to produce a given amount of revenues. Business as a whole, for tax purposes, should not be taxed on the basis that certain earnings—past and prospective—will yield a certain number of dollars. Rather, the effect of taxes on earnings as well as the effect on future taxes should be considered. The question might well be asked: Will these proposed tax rates stifle and retard business so that in effect the tax base will shrink and decrease revenue or will these tax rates encourage business to grow and expand their markets and, thereby broaden the tax base and in effect increase revenue?

We have come to the time or we are approaching the time when all Federal income taxes demand revision. There must be a limitation in both corporate and individual tax rates which precludes the confiscatory aspects now present in parts of our tax structure.

Because of the large Federal debt, the necessity for continued large expenditures for national defense and for many other reasons in connection with our Federal Government, the tax bill will be large for a long time to come. Reductions will occur through careful budgetary management. However, in full recognition of these facts, it is all the more reason that we should constantly strive to bring more and more equity into our income tax structure.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] stated in separate views on the Small Tax Revision Act of 1958—House Report No. 2198, 85th Congress, 2d session—on July 16, 1958:

This bill is called a tax-revision bill to avoid argument about the equities of where tax relief should be applied. However, the bill has been deprived of its revision features; the philosophy that calls for tax revision for small business has been eliminated and we have only a shell which covers pure and simple tax relief.

The Federal tax levy on earnings which is the basic source of financing for the growth of small business lies at the base of the increased number of uneconomic mergers and acquisitions of small businesses. Good economic and good social policy call for a healthy climate for small business and an opportunity to compete economically with the bigger competitor. No one benefits when business becomes highly concentrated.

It is this situation that calls for tax revision in the area of small business. If the theory is right, tax revision to remove these uneconomic barriers to growth would produce revenue gain, not losses. It would be tax relief only in the sense that uneconomic barriers to growth embedded in the tax system were being removed.

We agree with Mr. CURTIS, a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, and we have made similar comment many times in discussing tax revision and reform for small business. We further agree with Mr. CURTIS that "certainly the hand-to-mouth procedures we are following today are full of errors. The Treasury estimates of an-

ticipated revenues have been notoriously inaccurate over a period of years." This statement pointed up a fact that we have stressed on many occasions, namely, that too often tax reform and revision is put aside because of two primary excuses—first, loss of revenue, and, second, difficulty of administration.

We have also previously stated for the record our agreement with the conclusions of a report issued December 27, 1955, by the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Economic Committee which made a comprehensive study under the chairmanship of the present distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas. In this report the subcommittee said:

Federal tax policy in the future should protect the competitive position of small and new businesses by providing adequate tax offsets to business risks and by gearing the structure of tax rates to any differential barriers to acquiring the financial resources required for their growth and development.

The report also stated without equivocation that:

Federal tax policy should protect and promote an atmosphere favorable for small and new businesses.

We believe that one of the most important reasons for small business tax reform and revision, which will provide the means and incentives for growth and modernization, is the socialistic clamor for nationalization of industries. Unless we broaden the base and provide for the growth of small and medium sized businesses we shall inevitably be confronted with a greater merger problem than we now have. We do not believe that we should allow our tax structure to encourage mergers and consolidations which will eventually decrease the number of our industrial concerns to a minimum. In other words, we believe there are many industrial endeavors which require a large operation and, therefore, we do not intend to convey the idea that we are against big business as such. We do wish to point out, however, that bigness is something on which Congress should keep a watchful eye. We should do this with the thought in mind that we do not intend to allow the day to come when all business and industry will be cartelized to the total disadvantage of the ultimate consumer.

After all in framing our antitrust laws and in framing all legislation, including tax legislation, we must keep in mind the burden we share in common. We must always keep in mind the welfare and the protection of the individual ultimate consumer, those who in the final analysis pay the total tax bill.

#### FAMILY SIZE FARMS

In our present bill and in previous tax measures which we have introduced we gave recognition to the fact that modern farming is a business. Small farmers, whether they own the farms or farm in the capacity of renters or tenants, encounter similar problems to those which confront small businessmen. Modern farming requires modern machinery. The advance in technology has had the same impact on agricultural pursuits as it has in the manufacturing, proc-



essing or extraction industries. The equipment used in farming operations is expensive and the useful life of modern farming equipment is perhaps even less than in many other industries.

The farm plant requires more and better buildings than was the case before the age of machinery. All these considerations serve to emphasize the fact that family-size farms and farmers need exactly the same tax reform and revision that is needed by small business. The ability to plow back earnings is an absolute essential if we are to retain the very desirable family enterprise in our agricultural economy.

Thus, we include farms and farmers in our bill in consideration of the vital role of this way of life in our Nation.

#### EXPLANATION OF BILL

In brief, the purposes of the bill are spelled out in section I as follows:

To provide for growth, expansion, and modernization for small and independent business enterprises engaged in trade or commerce;

To permit individuals and partnerships filing income tax returns for small and independent businesses engaged in trade or commerce to revoke an election to be taxed as a corporation; to provide a normal tax rate of 20 percent for taxable years after June 30, 1959, and to increase the surtax exemption;

To provide a growth, expansion, and modernization exemption on net taxable earnings for small and independent businesses engaged in trade or commerce;

To liberalize the income tax treatment of losses incurred through loans to small and independent business enterprises engaged in trade or commerce;

To provide small and independent business an exemption for goodwill in the determination of the value of an estate;

To provide family-sized farmers and others engaged in agricultural pursuits an exemption for the improvement, modernization and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care, and marketing of farm products; and

To provide family-sized farms, whether or not such farms are owned in fee or occupied by renters or tenants, an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care, and marketing of the products of such farms.

#### DEDUCTION FOR EXPANSION OR MODERNIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

Section 2, probably the most important section of the bill, would permit small firms to take varying exemptions on their taxable income for plant expansion, modernization, and improvement. This section would permit the small operator earning less than \$150,000 a year to "treat expenditures which are paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for the construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, improvement, or acquisition of any facility, land building, machinery or equipment, or any part thereof, used in the trade or business as expenses which are not chargeable to capital account."

Designed to provide the greatest incentive to small firms with relatively low taxable income, this section provides for the following table of deductions:

If the small firm's taxable income is not over \$10,000, it may deduct for modernization and expansion purposes up to

50 percent of its taxable income; from \$10,000 to \$25,000, it may deduct \$5,000 plus 40 percent of the excess of taxable income over \$10,000; from \$25,000 to \$50,000, it may deduct \$11,000 plus 30 percent of the excess over \$25,000; from \$50,000 to \$100,000, it may deduct \$18,500 plus 20 percent of the excess over \$50,000; from \$100,000 to \$150,000, it may deduct \$28,500 plus 10 percent of the excess over \$100,000.

#### REDUCTION IN CORPORATE NORMAL TAX

Section 3 would reduce the normal corporate tax rate from the present 30 percent to 20 percent. Based on the premise that the corporate normal tax should be low, this section aims at increasing the resistance of small firms to sell out or to merge with their larger competitors, encouraging them to adopt the corporate form of doing business, and lessening their burden of obtaining working capital.

#### INCREASE IN CORPORATE SURTAX EXEMPTION

Section 4 would exempt firms earning up to \$150,000 a year from the 22 percent corporate surtaxes now applicable to companies earning about \$25,000. To offset the loss of revenue from this increased exemption, additional revenue could be obtained by increasing surtax rates at levels above \$150,000.

#### ELECTION OF INDIVIDUALS AND PARTNERSHIPS TO BE TAXED AS CORPORATIONS

Section 5 would permit small firms to elect to be taxed either as a small business or as a corporation so that decisions whether to incorporate will be made on factors other than taxes. This section would particularly benefit small firms having stockholders with modest incomes.

#### LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Section 6 would provide an incentive for persons to lend to small firms by providing them with more liberal treatment for losses on bad debts than the law presently allows. This section would stimulate the flow of private individual loans to small firms by permitting persons to charge off a bad debt against ordinary income.

#### DEPRECIATION OF USED PROPERTY

Section 7 would provide small firms with accelerated depreciation on their purchases of used equipment or property. This section would particularly aid small firms which are often forced to start in business by buying an old building, used machinery, or used display equipment.

#### EXEMPTION FOR GOODWILL IN DETERMINING GROSS ESTATE

Section 8 would provide an exemption from estate taxes for the so-called goodwill of a firm as an incentive to its owners to continue the business after the death of one of its leading figures. The law at present allows the Internal Revenue Service to include the value of goodwill in computing estate taxes.

The full text of our bill follows:

#### A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO ASSIST SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

#### SECTION 1. DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, and the purpose of this Act—to provide for growth, expansion, and modernization for small and independent business enterprises engaged in trade or commerce;

to permit individuals and partnerships filing income tax returns for small and independent businesses engaged in trade or commerce to revoke an election to be taxed as a corporation;

to provide a normal tax rate of 20 percent for taxable years after June 30, 1959, and to increase the surtax exemption;

to provide a growth, expansion, and modernization exemption on net taxable earnings for small and independent businesses engaged in trade or commerce;

to liberalize the income tax treatment of losses incurred through loans to small and independent business enterprises engaged in trade or commerce;

to provide small and independent business an exemption for goodwill in the determination of the value of an estate;

to provide family-sized farmers and others engaged in agricultural pursuits an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care, and marketing of farm products; and

to provide family-sized farms, whether or not such farms are owned in fee or occupied by renters or tenants, an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care, and marketing of the products of such farms.

#### SEC. 2. DEDUCTION FOR EXPANSION OR MODERNIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

(a) ALLOWANCE.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

#### "SEC. 180. EXPANSION OR MODERNIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FACILITIES

"(a) DEDUCTIBLE EXPENDITURES.—If the taxable income of any person engaged in trade or business does not exceed \$150,000 for the taxable year, such person may treat expenditures which are paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for the construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, improvement, or acquisition of any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, used in the trade or business as expenses which are not chargeable to capital account to the extent that such expenditures do not exceed the limit determined under the following table:

If the taxable income is:	The limit is:
Not over \$10,000----	50 percent of taxable income.
Over \$10,000 but not over \$25,000-----	\$5,000, plus 40 percent of excess of taxable income over \$10,000.
Over \$25,000 but not over \$50,000-----	\$11,000, plus 30 percent of excess of taxable income over \$25,000.
Over \$50,000 but not over \$100,000-----	\$18,500, plus 20 percent of excess over \$50,000.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$150,000--	\$28,500, plus 10 percent of excess over \$100,000.

The expenditures so treated shall be allowed as a deduction.

"(b) Limitations.—

"(1) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any corporation which, directly or indirectly, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, any other corporation at any time during the taxable year, unless the combined taxable income of all such companies under common control does not exceed \$150,000.

"(2) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any partnership which, directly or indirectly, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, any other partnership at any time during the taxable year, unless the combined taxable income of all such partnerships under common control does not exceed \$150,000.

"(3) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid or incurred which is allowable as a deduction without regard to this section, and shall apply only with respect to expenditures for construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or improvement, of any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or part thereof, begun and completed, or acquired, during the period consisting of the taxable year and the preceding taxable year.

"(c) TAXABLE INCOME DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'taxable income' means taxable income computed without regard to this section."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 180. EXPANSION OR MODERNIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FACILITIES."

(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO BASIS OF PROPERTY.—Section 1016(a) of such Code (relating to adjustments to basis of property) is amended by inserting after paragraph (16) the following new paragraph:

"(17) for amounts allowed as deductions under section 180 (relating to expansion or modernization of small business facilities);".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

### SEC. 3. REDUCTION IN CORPORATE NORMAL TAX.

Section 11(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to corporate normal tax for taxable years beginning after June 30, 1959) is amended by striking out "25 percent of the taxable income" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 percent of the taxable income".

### SEC. 4. INCREASE IN CORPORATE SURTAX EXEMPTION

(a) INCREASE IN EXEMPTION.—Section 11(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to corporate surtax) is amended by striking out "\$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$150,000."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 12(7) of such Code (cross references relating to tax on corporations) is amended by striking out "\$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$150,000."

(2) Section 1551 of such Code (relating to disallowance of surtax exemption, etc.) is amended by striking out "\$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$150,000," and by striking out "such exemption or credit" and inserting in lieu thereof "the exemption from surtax provided in section 11(c) or the securing of such credit."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after June 30, 1959. In the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1959, and ending after June 30, 1959, the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply in the same manner as provided in section 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to changes in a rate of tax.

### SEC. 5. ELECTION OF INDIVIDUALS AND PARTNERSHIPS TO BE TAXED AS CORPORATIONS.

Section 1361(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to irrevocability of elections of partnerships and individuals to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended by adding after paragraph (2) thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, an election described in subsection (a) may be revoked, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, with respect to taxable years following the fourth or any subsequent taxable year to which such election applies."

### SEC. 6. LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES.

(a) ALLOWANCE OF LOSSES AND BAD DEBTS AS DEDUCTIONS FROM ORDINARY INCOME.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting after section 166 the following new section:

"SEC. 166A. LOSSES OF INDIVIDUALS ON LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES.

"(a) LOSSES ON DEBTS EVIDENCED BY SECURITIES.—If an individual sustains a loss from the sale or other disposition or from the worthlessness, of a debt evidenced by a security of a corporation which is a small business enterprise, then for purposes of this subtitle such loss shall not be considered as a loss from the sale or exchange of a capital asset.

"(b) BAD DEBTS.—Section 166(d) (relating to nonbusiness debts) shall not apply in the case of an individual if the debt was created by reason of a loan by such individual to a small business enterprise. For purposes of section 166 (other than subsection (d)), a payment by an individual in discharge of part or all of his obligation as a guarantor, endorser, or indemnitor of an obligation of a small business enterprise created by reason of a loan to such enterprise by another individual shall be treated as a debt becoming worthless at the time of such payment.

"(c) NET OPERATING LOSS DEDUCTION.—For purposes of section 172(d)(4) (relating to limitation on nonbusiness deductions of taxpayers other than corporations for purposes of the net operating loss deduction) any deduction in respect of which subsection (a) or (b) of this section applies shall be treated as attributable to a trade or business of the taxpayer.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'debt evidenced by a security' means only a bond, debenture, note, or certificate, or other evidence of indebtedness, issued by a corporation with interest coupons or in registered form.

"(2) The term 'small business enterprise' means any trade or business carried on by an individual, partnership, or corporation if the total assets held (at the time the security is acquired or the loan is made) by such individual, partnership, or corporation for trade or business purposes does not exceed \$250,000; but such term does not include any corporation the stock of which is owned (directly or indirectly) by or for more than 10 individuals."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part VI is amended by inserting

"SEC. 166A. LOSSES OF INDIVIDUALS ON LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES."

immediately below

"SEC. 166. Bad debts."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with

respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

### SEC. 7. DEPRECIATION OF USED PROPERTY.

(a) Section 167(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitations on use of certain methods and rates of depreciation) is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) acquired after December 31, 1958, if the original use of such property does not commence with the taxpayer, and the use of such property by the taxpayer commences after such date.

Paragraph (3) shall apply to property acquired in any taxable year only to the extent that the basis of such property (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition), when added to the basis of all other property described in such paragraph (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition), which is acquired by the taxpayer during the same taxable year, does not exceed \$50,000."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

### SEC. 8. EXEMPTION FOR GOODWILL IN DETERMINING GROSS ESTATE

(a) ALLOWANCE OF EXEMPTION.—Part III of subchapter A of chapter 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to gross estate of citizens or residents of the United States) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 2045. GOODWILL.

"In determining the value of any interest of the decedent in any trade or business carried on by the decedent, by a partnership of which he was a partner, or by a corporation stock of which was owned (directly or indirectly) by or for not more than 10 individuals (including the decedent), the goodwill of such trade or business shall be excluded. The amount excluded from the gross estate by reason of the preceding sentence shall not exceed \$100,000."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part III is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 2045. GOODWILL."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this act.

### "WHY ARE YOU SAVING?"

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it may be a bit old fashioned, but shortly after graduation from college I embarked upon a program which I thought would provide for my security in later years. I used, as a basis for my program, insurance, for with four children it was imperative that there be adequate protection for my wife and children.

With each new spin in the inflationary spiral I have been forced to reassess my program from time to time and adjust it upward, for what I planned to have set aside in retirement benefits



dollarwise will not give me at some future date what I thought I would have 10 years ago. It follows that if we experience the same degree of inflation in the next 10 years I will have to go still further by way of adjusting my program upward, and I am wondering if the end is ever in sight or whether I will ever be able to catch up.

In the Chicago Tribune Sunday edition of April 19 there appeared a front page editorial, which I should like to have reprinted at this point in the RECORD, entitled, "Why Are You Saving?" The tone of the editorial struck a responsive chord with me and I recommend it as good reading for every American.

#### WHY ARE YOU SAVING?

Are you saving for your old age?  
Why, for heaven's sake?

It may seem a silly question. If you are going to quit work, you certainly have to have something put by against the day that the paychecks stop. What else can you do if you want to retire?

You can't do anything, of course. You are in the same fix as the man who was warned that the roulette wheel he was playing was crooked. He knew it, but it was the only roulette wheel in town.

Anybody who saves today for some future period is putting his dollars on the crooked roulette wheel of inflation. The people to whom he intrusts his money—insurance company, stockbroker, pension trustee, the Social Security Administrator—aren't the crooked croupiers. They are honest. Every dollar you give them you will get back, with interest.

It isn't until you start to spend the money you saved that you find the wheel was crooked. If we take the experience of the last 20 years as a guide, the dollar you put away today will be worth less than 50 cents, at today's prices, when you spend it 20 years from now.

Suppose you put a dollar away 20 years ago, in 1939. Applied to your living expenses today it would buy only 48 cents as much as it would have when you saved it.

That is the ground on which inflation hurts us all. We may think that a little inflation is something nice—so long as we keep working. We like to see our pay go up. If we buy stocks, we like to see them go up.

If we are farmers, we like the Government to support prices—buy our crops at far higher prices than they command in a free market. If we are businessmen, we like the orders that come from foreign aid and the vast military spending.

In short, we all like the effects of inflation—which all of these practices cause—even if we do think that inflation itself is a nasty word.

But sooner or later ninety-nine out of a hundred of us are caught in the same box. We want to retire. Whatever provision we have made for retirement, we are going to find that continuing inflation slashes the value—the purchasing power—of what we have saved. We have about half as much to live on as we thought we would have when we put the money away.

So we buy equities—common stocks that increase in price as the dollar slips in value. People are buying equities like mad. They have boosted their prices to the point where they yield, at the current market, 3.3 percent a year. Government bonds yield around 4 percent. Insurance against inflation—against being paid off in dollars—costs you a fifth of earnings on your investment, beyond which you also assume the risk that

the stock may not earn a dividend some year.

There is just one way out of the box, one way to insure that the money you put away for old age will support you when you retire. That is to stop inflation.

#### UNION BACKING AT THE POLLS

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an article by Congressional Quarterly which appeared in the Detroit Free Press on April 14, 1959, casts some rather revealing looks at union funds and their uses during the last general election. There is little argument with the fact that the amounts listed by unions do not truly reflect the total amount of union participation in the last election. But they give those of us in Congress an indication of what is happening in our campaigns. It is going to be interesting to note the way that these Members of Congress vote on matters affecting labor unions and the positions of these unions on various national issues.

#### WHAT LABOR SPENT IN 1958 ELECTIONS—WHO THE UNIONS BACKED AT POLLS WITH DOLLARS

WASHINGTON.—When a Democrat needs money for a campaign these days, he is likely to find labor unions in a better position to help him than his own party committees. That seems to have been the case in 1958, at least.

A Congressional Quarterly survey, completed Monday, shows labor unions spent more money on the last election than the Democratic National Committee and its adjuncts in the House and Senate campaign.

The survey, which may throw some light on the continuing controversy over labor's influence in politics, shows that union funds reached at least 233 candidates for Congress in 46 of the 49 States in 1958. Of these candidates, 152 were elected.

The only States that did not find a place on labor's list were Arkansas, New Hampshire, and South Carolina.

Indications are that Republicans received the benefit of only 1 or 2 percent of the money laid out by the unions.

Unions cannot legally spend any money from their treasuries in connection with Federal elections. They are barred from using members' dues for partisan purposes, just as corporations are denied the right to tap their stockholders' equity to make political contributions.

But the unions can and do ask their members to contribute money voluntarily to political funds. These voluntary dollars make up labor's campaign war chest, from which the needs of friendly candidates are supplied.

How important the labor war chest has become is indicated by a few comparisons.

Thirty-two of organized labor's political committees reported spending a total of \$1,828,777 on the 1958 campaign.

That was relatively small potatoes compared to the \$4,657,652 campaign outlay reported by 14 Republican committees.

But it exceeded the \$1,702,605 spending by seven Democratic committees on the 1958 campaign. The combined Democratic-labor

total fell about \$1.2 million short of reported GOP outlays.

Actually, of course, Republican, Democratic, and labor figures are all misleadingly small. The only political committees that have to report to the House are those that operate in more than one State.

Political groups whose activities are limited to a single State, city, or district do not have to report, although some do so voluntarily. Thus, accurate figures on all campaign spending—National, State, and local—are impossible to obtain.

But the figures reported by the big multi-State committees indicate pretty clearly that in 1958, for the first time, organized labor plunked more money into the Democratic campaign kitty than the national Democratic committees themselves did.

Total spending of the Democratic, national, senatorial, congressional committees was \$1,340,636.

The big five of organized labor alone spent a nearly equal amount—\$1,333,181.

The AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education reported expenditures of \$709,813.

Walter P. Reuther's UAW reported money in three separate political accounts, but the net expenditures were computed at \$243,790.

David J. McDonald's United Steelworkers said it spent \$192,136 on politics.

David Dubinsky's International Ladies' Garment Workers Union chipped in \$107,716.

And the Machinists, headed by Albert J. Hayes, spent \$79,726.

The 27 other labor committees that reported in Washington chipped in lesser amounts to bring the total up to \$1,828,777.

Two of the best-known unions—the Teamsters and the United Mine Workers—did not file political spending reports at all. Spokesmen told Congressional Quarterly their contributions were made at the State and local level, where they do not have to be reported in Washington.

The men who handle labor's big political money are shrewd investors.

In 1958 they put the biggest stakes on 10 Democratic senatorial hopefuls and saw all but one of them come through to victory.

The lone disappointment was former Gov. George M. Leader, Democrat, who had \$16,000 of union members' money riding with him in his unsuccessful Pennsylvania Senate race.

The biggest supplies of cash were earmarked for Leader and these other Democrats:

1. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Wisconsin, \$25,625.
2. Senator CLAIR ENGLE, California, \$24,950.
3. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, New Jersey, \$20,900.
4. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut, \$19,400.
- 5 and 6. Senators ROBERT C. BYRD and JENNINGS RANDOLPH, \$19,000 each for the twin races in West Virginia.
7. Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska, \$16,750.
8. Senator PHILIP A. HART, Michigan, \$16,600.
9. Senator GALE MCGEE, Wyoming, \$15,500.

The analysis indicates clearly that labor's political braintrusting is willing to gamble heavily with the membership's voluntary dollars when they think a long-shot has a chance to win.

PROXMIRE was the only holdover Senator on the list of the top 10 recipients of union support, and his race was regarded as the toughest any Democratic incumbent faced.

The other nine all had strenuous contests against substantial opponents. Yet, all but Leader won. Seven of the winners took over Republican seats.

At the same time, it appears that the union men did not waste much money currying favor with Democrats who were assured of victory.

Where Gruening was given \$16,750 for his nip-and-tuck race against Republican Mike Stepovich in Alaska, no money at all was reported earmarked for his colleague and running-mate Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT (Democrat, Alaska), who stands equally high in labor's estimation. The reason: BARTLETT had only token opposition.

A check for \$2,500 from the COPE to aid the campaign of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts, was canceled when Massachusetts labor leaders informed national headquarters KENNEDY "didn't need the money."

Despite this hardheaded attitude, union leaders found reason to earmark some funds for all but 6 of the 36 Democratic candidates for the Senate in 1958.

Those who apparently did not share in the largesse were: Bartlett; Raymond G. Vendsel, the Democratic nominee in North Dakota; and four Southerners, Senators Spessard L. Holland, Florida, John C. Stennis, Mississippi, B. Everett Jordan, North Carolina, and Harry Flood Byrd, Virginia.

Republicans, on the other hand, found it very hard to pry open labor's pocketbook. Only \$13,850 of union's reported total spending of \$1,828,777 was earmarked for Republican candidates.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, North Dakota, who votes more often with the Democrats than with his own party, was down for a total of \$7,000 from COPE and the Steelworkers.

The Steelworkers earmarked \$1,000 for ex-California Republican Gov. Goodwin J. Knight but reported contributing twice that much to Democratic Senator CLAIR ENGLE, who defeated him in the Senate race.

In House races, three contributions to Republicans were listed by the unions:

1. Representative JOHN B. BENNETT, Michigan, \$3,000 from Railway Labor's Political League.
2. Representative GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey, \$750 from the Steelworkers and \$500 from the International Ladies' Garment Worker's Union.
3. Representative THOMAS M. PELL, Washington, \$450 from Railway Labor's Political League.
4. Representative THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Washington, \$400 from the National Maritime Union.
5. Ex-Representative Albert P. Morano, Connecticut, \$250 from the Machinists.
6. Grover Cantrell, a union official who ran unsuccessfully against Representative BRUCE ALGER (Republican, Texas) in the primary, \$500 from the Communications Workers.

#### UNIONS PUT UP \$16,600 FOR HART

WASHINGTON.—Organized labor earmarked \$50,141 for the 1958 election in Michigan, Congressional Quarterly reported Saturday.

The figure was disclosed by a careful search through the official reports of 32 labor political committees filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Reports were filed by most of the politically active labor internationals, but their State and local affiliates are not required to file in Washington and only a few did so voluntarily.

Of the \$50,141 reported spent in Michigan on the 1958 campaign, \$24,170 went to Democratic candidates and committees and \$3,000 to Republicans.

The remaining \$22,971 was sent to local labor committees and others to be spent by them.

Individual candidates identified in the Labor Committee reports and the sums reported sent to each were:

Senate—PHILIP A. HART (Democrat),

House—Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, \$750; Robert G. Hall, \$250; Don Hayworth, \$1,750; James G. O'Hara, \$1,500; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., \$250; Louis C. Rabaut, \$250; John D. Dingell, \$250; John Lesinski, \$500; Martha W. Griffiths, \$1,000; Leslie H. Hudson, \$740, all Democrats, and John B. Bennett, \$3,000, a Republican.

Only Hudson, Hayworth, and Hall failed to win their elections.

#### JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as so many others have done throughout the world, I want to express my admiration for the great work that has been done by Mr. John Foster Dulles. At the same time it is certainly my present wish and prayer that he may speedily recover from his affliction. Also that he may soon be able to take again a more active part in the affairs of our Government and in the efforts to preserve an honorable international peace. Through the years that I have known him, my own admiration for Mr. Dulles has steadily increased. I have observed the training, experience, and dedication which he has brought to his Office as Secretary of State of the United States. Certainly all Americans know that no task was ever too arduous, no journey too long, no conferences too difficult for Mr. Dulles to undertake. He had a calm, logical type of mind—one in which his legal training and background was frequently apparent. When answering questions or making decisions, he was prone to deliberate briefly, obviously turning over all considerations in his mind before stating the conclusions that he reached. By doing this he avoided the situation in which public figures too often find themselves. That is, where conclusions are uttered in haste and later have to be retracted or modified. He was a realist in international affairs. In seeking to solve problems which confronted him, he would take into account all the factors that would play a part in the decision. In this connection he also understood the influences and the considerations which were in the minds of the foreign statesmen with whom he was dealing. Because of this ability on his part, the negotiations in which he participated very frequently reached more fruitful conclusions.

But I think of all the characteristics he had, the one which I respect the most was his courage and his willingness "to stand up and be counted." This was particularly apparent in his dealings with the Communists. He knew that it was of no use to give in to their demands and when he was sure he was right, he stood his ground. This perhaps more than any other one thing that he did while he was Secretary of State helped to preserve peace in the world. Here was a man representing a country that desired not a foot of land belonging to any other nation, but a man dedicated

to the preservation of the rights of men and the protection of the freedoms of nations. This courage and willingness to take a stand was sometimes called inflexibility, but I think it was not so much that as it was the understanding that one who represented this Nation of ours must be willing to take positions which would be for the best interest of our country and at the same time, of course, for the best interest of free men everywhere.

Through the years that he has been Secretary of State, he has been a tower of strength for the entire free world. We are grateful for what he has done and I repeat, we sincerely hope that his health may improve and that he may have a long time in which to enjoy the rest and relaxation he has so richly earned.

#### PRESERVING GETTYSBURG BATTLEFIELD AS SACRED NATIONAL SHRINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Monday evening I had occasion to speak to the Rotary Club of Gettysburg, Pa., and through it to deliver a message to the entire Gettysburg community.

At this time I would like to share that message with the Members of Congress and through them to deliver it to the larger nationwide audience which, I believe, the subject under discussion deserves. That subject is the preservation of the Gettysburg battlefield as a sacred national shrine.

On March 24, the House of Representatives considered and passed the 1960 appropriation for the Department of the Interior. During the debate on that measure I noted with regret that the Appropriations Committee had seen fit to delete from the bill the request of the National Park Service for money to be used for the acquisition of additional Civil War battlefield lands. My particular concern in this regard arose from the fact that a considerable portion of the money was earmarked for the purchase of some 600 additional acres within and adjoining the present battlefield area at Gettysburg.

I would like at this time to highlight the basis for my concern, to point up the problem which faces Gettysburg and the Congress, and why I think it is an important problem and, finally, I would like to suggest what I believe to be a workable solution.

The problem facing Gettysburg is this: The Federal Government presently owns some 2,800 acres of the soil on which the historic battle was fought. From the beginning the basic objective of the Congress in authorizing the acquisition of this land was to preserve it as it was when the battle took place. To a considerable extent this objective has been achieved. However, this success is explained only in part by the efforts and the acquisitions by the Federal Government. The very nature of the land involved has had much to do with the results achieved. A substantial portion of



the battle was waged over what was then pretty good farmland. It still is. And for this reason, rather than because of anything the Federal Government might have done, it is not surprising that much of this soil is still being tilled as it was 96 years ago. Other parts of the battle involved impossibly rocky terrain not fit for agricultural or, for that matter, any other use. The passage of time has not made these rocky ways any more usable and so they have remained pretty much intact and undisturbed since those 3 days in July of 1863.

However, as anyone who even approaches Gettysburg can testify, the objective of preserving the battlefield area has been something less than a complete success. This is true for a variety of reasons; some valid, some not. Certainly No. 1 among the valid reasons is the inevitability of growth. When history met at its crossroads Gettysburg was a pretty small town with a population of not too much in excess of 2,000. Without, I trust, offending local pride I think it must be said that Gettysburg is still a small town. But in 1959 it is some four times larger than it was in 1863. This growth could not and did not take place without in some way disturbing the battlefield.

Almost from the day the guns went silent, certainly since the day when Lincoln spoke his immortal words, Gettysburg has been an American tourist mecca. At first the growth in tourism was relatively slow and confined to relatives of those who had fought here, and to students of the battle. However, with the advent of the automobile Gettysburg became accessible to every American with an urge to travel. The result has been that tourism is and has been the town's biggest industry for many years. Some three-quarters of a million people now visit Gettysburg annually. Most of these visitors have to be fed. A considerable number of them have to be housed. If Gettysburg failed to meet these needs it would rightly be criticized. Yet these needs cannot be met adequately and well without a certain amount of commercialism happening. This commercialism has, of course, caused the appearance of the town and the area to change from the way it was back in 1863.

Unfortunately the adverse results of the inevitable growth and necessary commercialization have been greater than it should have been because it has been allowed to happen without planning or an overall sense of direction. Despite this, much of the growth has been highly desirable. Unfortunately, in some instances much was left to be desired and in at least a few cases what has happened could only be deplored. Under these circumstances the only thing that the Federal Government could do to carry out its original purpose of preserving the battlefield area was to acquire more and more land.

However, there are some pretty obvious drawbacks to this land acquisition approach. In the first place, from the point of view of the Federal Government it is frightfully expensive and gets more so every year. In the second place,

it is only partially effective. It is just not possible even for the Federal Government to buy up every last foot of ground on which every soldier set foot, in or on his way to and from the battle. Yet, at the very point where the Government stops buying there is nothing to prevent the erection of the most desecrating honky-tonk joints imaginable.

Nor do all the disadvantages of the land acquisition program run in the direction of the Federal Government. It is true that every time the Park Service acquires additional land it takes money out of the Federal Treasury but it also—indirectly—takes money out of the coffers of the local governments as well. This is so because the moment Uncle Sam takes title to the land it becomes tax exempt, and thereafter the local taxing authorities are denied forever the revenue which had come from that land as long as it was privately owned.

This tax-exempt status has created quite a problem in Adams County and especially so in Cumberland Township. The great bulk of the battlefield lies in Cumberland Township and just about all of the 2,762 acres which the Federal Government now owns, as well as the 600 additional acres it proposes to acquire, lies within this township. Needless to say, the Federal land acquisition program has a tremendous impact on local governmental units like Cumberland Township which is struggling to meet the evergrowing demands for better schools and better roads and all the other services the people are now demanding.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, one might very well ask two pointed questions. First, if the National Park's land acquisition program has such obvious drawbacks for both the Federal and local governments, was not the House of Representatives, by its vote on March 24, right in calling a halt to it? Secondly, if I am so aware of these defects why did I bother to raise my lonesome voice of protest against the House action?

Despite the shortcomings and defects in the program I believe the House was wrong in rejecting it and I will tell you why.

In my judgment the House acted as it did for three reasons. First, there was the general acceptance of the idea that the Federal Government already had enough land at Gettysburg. Second, there was a feeling that you never could buy enough battlefield lands to satisfy the cravings of the Civil War enthusiasts. Third, and the most important reason, was the balanced budget psychosis which is currently haunting the Congress of the United States.

If I am any judge of why the House voted as it did, I am convinced that many of the Members said to themselves, "All right, if the President is really serious about this balanced budget, let us show him that, like charity, balanced budgets begin at home. What better way can we strike a telling blow for economy in Government than by publicly slashing from the President's budget more than a million dollars, most of which was earmarked for spending right in the President's backyard." This, in my judgment, is why the House acted as it did.

I, too, am interested in a balanced budget but I cannot agree that the approach of the House in this instance is the sound way to reach a worthwhile goal.

As to the other arguments, while I am willing to concede that not even Uncle Sam would be rich enough to buy all the land at all the battlefields which many of the Civil War enthusiasts want, I very strongly disagree with those who contend that the Federal Government already has enough land at Gettysburg.

In the first place, Gettysburg just is not any battlefield of any war. It is not even just any battlefield of the Civil War. Gettysburg is Gettysburg: the site of one of the truly decisive battles in the whole of history. At Gettysburg the future of this country came to the crossroads. Here brave men fought and died not only that this Nation might live but to resolve how it would live.

In the second place, the Federal Government does not yet have enough property at Gettysburg because only by means of Federal acquisition can certain unfortunate errors of the past be deleted and their desecrating presence be removed from this hallowed ground. This is why, in my judgment, the action of the House was in error and this is why I trust the Senate will act otherwise.

But even if the Senate and ultimately the whole Congress and the President provide the money to acquire these additional lands, the problem is not solved. At Gettysburg it is not only necessary to correct past errors, it is essential that future ones be avoided.

To this latter end I have a very positive answer: Zoning.

I am happy to report that I have already discussed this idea of zoning with representatives of Cumberland Township and the National Park Service. I am even happier to be able to report that in each instance the suggestion was met with a most favorable reaction.

Here is exactly what I would like to see happen. And I told this to the Gettysburg community. I would hope that with a minimum of delay the supervisors of Cumberland Township would enact into law an ordinance which provides for zoning of the battlefield area and territory adjacent thereto which has been approved by the National Park Service.

In return for this effort at the local level—and I am sufficiently close to the political scene to be fully aware that the enactment of an effective zoning law can require a tremendous effort and sometimes even real courage—I would propose the following quid pro quo from the Federal Government. Henceforth, the National Park Service would agree to share with Cumberland Township, with the Cumberland Township School District and with Adams County, the three local taxing authorities, a portion of the rents collected from the leasing of federally owned land within the battlefield area.

This plan would operate roughly as follows: At the present time if the National Park Service acquires a farm which is valued at, say, \$50,000, the

owner is paid full value for his property. Before he sold to the Federal Government that owner was paying local taxes in the amount, let us assume, of \$250 annually. After the sale, as I have already noted, no local taxes are paid. And this is true despite the fact that very often the Park Service will lease back the farm to the former owner or lease it to a new tenant who agrees to operate the farm under conditions specified by the Park Service.

Let us suppose that in our illustrated situation the former owner continues to operate the farm under a lease which requires him to pay the Federal Government an annual rental of \$1,000. Thus we end up with this situation. On the one hand the former owner has \$50,000 in the bank and he is still operating the farm. On the other hand the Federal Government has title to the land plus the assurance that the property will at no time in the future be used for any unauthorized purpose and in addition \$1,000 goes into the Federal Treasury each year the property is rented. In sharp contrast to the former owner-present operator and Uncle Sam, the poor local taxing authorities—the township, the school district, and the county—end up with nothing.

Under my scheme the annual rental on the farm would be increased by \$250—the amount formerly paid in local taxes—and this additional sum which the Federal Government collects would be turned over to the local government units to be divided among them on the same ratio as they share in the total of all other local taxes collected.

Such a proposal would certainly help the local governments involved. It would mean no loss of revenue to the Federal Government because it would still receive the same amount of rent it collected formerly. Not only would it not cost the Federal Government money, it would save it substantial amounts because with that zoning ordinance on the books the need for purchasing additional lands would be greatly reduced.

The increased cost involved would fall upon the National Park Service's tenants. Now I recognize that it might be somewhat impolitic for me to suggest that the additional burden be placed on some of my constituents but I dare to do it because we are faced with a problem which cries for a solution; and also because I have every reason to believe that in the past the Park Service has tended to charge rentals which were most reasonable. Even with the increased rental which I am suggesting most of the farms would still be real bargains and in great demand.

Now I recognize that making this plan a reality is going to take a lot of doing. There's bound to be opposition to any zoning proposal. There always is. My rental sharing plan would require the cooperation of three local governments and at least two different departments of the Federal Government and getting such cooperation can be no mean assignment. In addition, it is my judgment that such a rental sharing plan could only be put into operation with the approval of Congress. I trust you will

understand if I am a little hesitant to predict what the Congress might do.

But I think that the kind of doing it will take is well worth the effort because failure to find a workable solution means the ultimate desecration of the Gettysburg battlefield as a sacred national shrine. In this effort I call upon the Gettysburg community for your help.

Certainly it was not necessary for me to point out to them, the business and professional leaders of the community, that in Gettysburg they are blessed with something unique. Its very presence, however, presents certain very real problems. Failure to face up to these problems in the past has caused them to get worse. Unless they are faced soon it may be too late. The goose may gouge itself to death and with its passing go all the golden eggs.

Mr. Speaker, it is fashionable to criticize people for always looking to the Federal Government for help. I do not know whether such criticism is always valid but it certainly is popular. Right now Gettysburg is looking to the Federal Government for help and unless the temper of the Congress changes radically in a very short time, I believe that Gettysburg will look to Washington in vain. The Lord helps those who help themselves. I have a feeling Congress might be inclined to do the same. If the people of Greater Gettysburg—especially the people in the borough of Gettysburg and in Cumberland Township—will move forward on a program such as I have just suggested I am confident that the current negative attitude in Congress could change sharply.

If Gettysburg fails to act and in turn the Congress fails to act then, frankly, I look forward to 1963 and Gettysburg with grave misgivings. Because, as I have noted during the floor debate on March 24, I am afraid that by then, when the spotlight of the Nation and the world is focused on Gettysburg to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the battle, we will discover too late and to our sorrow that the second battle of Gettysburg—the fight to prevent the desecration of this sacred monument by unwarranted commercialization—already has been lost.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman for his excellent statement on the problem that exists at Gettysburg. As a member of the Civil War Centennial Commission I can assure the gentleman that there is a feeling in the Commission and among the Commission members it is, I am quite sure, unanimous, and also among those who have been designated as advisory members of the Commission, that we ought to do something now to preserve the great heritage that exists at Gettysburg. The gentleman stated very well, it seems to me, that Gettysburg was not just another battle. It is the crossroads. It is where the destiny of our country was determined, and we ought to do all we can to preserve it. I recall on one side of

the Archives Building is a statement "What is past is prologue," in other words, that the heritage of the past brings forth the future. And, in my opinion, here at Gettysburg we have one of the great heritages and great historic centers of our Nation. I am very glad that the gentleman has explored different possibilities of solution of this problem and that he has taken it up with the people of the community. I want to assure the gentleman as one Member of the Congress on this side that I will do everything I can to help bring about a reversion of the position of the Congress so that we can preserve this valuable site and move forward to make it a more attractive site than it is now.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I hope and trust that the Congress of the United States in its ultimate wisdom will reverse the position it took here on March 24. However, as I pointed out, even if it does, this will only serve to correct past mistakes. I do believe and I trust that I will convince the people in the Gettysburg area that as far as the future is concerned, that future is very much in their own hands. The Congress of the United States cannot forever and everlastingly come in with hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars to buy up more and more land. Money is needed, in my judgment, primarily to correct the errors of the past. But, I am convinced that the only ultimate solution of the problem, however much the Members of the Congress might wish it to be otherwise, must come from the people at the local level. It is my hope that they will recognize this and that they will act and act quickly. So quickly, in fact, that the Congress of the United States, having seen how they have acted and how they have reacted to the challenge, will, in turn, reverse its decision and make the money available to the National Park Service. In the end, through the cooperation of all the government units affected, local, State, and National, we hope we will succeed in doing what I believe every Member of the Congress wants to see done, that is, to preserve the Gettysburg battlefield as one of the Nation's true monuments, which is, after all, what it is.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was interested in the gentleman's proposition to have a portion of the rent assigned to replace taxes. Now, I have a lot of Federal property in my district, and I recognize the problem that it has created. So, I am sympathetic with this problem, and I am wondering if we can handle this and not disturb all the other arrangements similar to this that have been made with public bodies. In other words, would your proposition be constitutional?

Mr. QUIGLEY. To the best of my knowledge, it would be. I know of one instance involving one national park, Jackson Hole or the Grand Teton, I believe, where an arrangement, not quite identical but with similarities to what I am suggesting here, was enacted by the Congress. This, I believe, happened back in 1950. While I confess I have not



made an exhaustive study of the problem, my initial judgment is that there is no constitutional question involved here.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MULDER (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FORRESTER, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLF, for 90 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. SCHENCK, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. COAD, for 60 minutes, on Monday, next.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. CURTIN), for 15 minutes, on April 23.

Mr. QUIGLEY (at the request of Mr. GEORGE), for 45 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WOLF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUDDLESTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON and include a broadcast on the Manion Forum of Social Security.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. CURTIN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

(At the request of Mr. GEORGE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MULDER.

Mr. ROBINO.

Mr. HECHLER.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5508. An act to provide for the free importation of articles for exhibition at fairs, exhibitions, or expositions, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, April 23, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

859. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 5, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis., requested by the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted January 28, 1955, and June 29, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

860. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of No. 2 of the Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report to the Congress, for the period ending December 31, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

861. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Quarterly Report on the Liquidation Operations of Business and Disaster Loans of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the Period Ending December 31, 1958, pursuant to the provisions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (67 Stat. 230), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

862. A letter from the Acting Director, International Cooperation Administration, transmitting a copy of reply to the Comptroller General of the United States relating to the General Accounting Office report on their examination of the assistance program for Pakistan for the fiscal years 1955 through 1957, as administered by the International Cooperation Administration under the mutual security program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

863. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting a report prior to restoration of balances as of March 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

864. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subdivision c of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67c) so as to clarify time for review of orders of referees"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

865. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

866. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Angelina Diaz De Hernandez, A-2561599, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

867. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 3, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Pine Island Bayou, Tex., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

868. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1959 in the amount of \$45 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Admin-

istration (H. Doc. No. 114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

869. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the examination of the pricing of certain Department of the Navy contracts with the Air Arm Division, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

870. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to the receipt of a project proposal relating to the Hights Creek Irrigation Co., of Kaysville, Utah, having applied for a loan of \$214,000 on a project estimated to cost \$228,000, pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

871. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise certain provisions relating to the promotion and involuntary retirement of officers of the Regular components of the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

872. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain generals of the Army to accept and wear decorations, orders, medals, presents, and other things tendered them by foreign governments"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

873. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the limited review of selected off-shore procurement contracts awarded and administered by the Directorate of Procurement and Production, Air Materiel Force, European area, in fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956; to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5460. A bill to donate to the Pueblo of Isleta certain Federal property in the State of New Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 95. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 451 of the 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 276). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 157. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the staff report entitled "The Next Ten Years in Space, 1959-69"; with amendment (Rept. No. 277). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 168. Resolution to print as a House document the publication "Committee on Un-American Activities—What It Is—What It Does," and to provide for the printing of additional copies; without amendment (Rept. No. 278). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 169. Resolution to print as a House document the publication "Patterns of Espionage" and to provide for the printing of additional copies; without amendment (Rept. No. 279). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 170. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional

copies of House Report No. 1724, 85th Congress, 2d session; without amendment (Rept. No. 280). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 177. Resolution authorizing the printing of the publication "U.S. Capitol Page School"; with amendment (Rept. No. 281). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 194. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of House Report No. 2713, 85th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 282). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 201. Resolution authorizing the printing of a report entitled "U.S. Foreign Aid, Its Purposes, Scope, Administration, and Related Information"; with amendment (Rept. No. 283). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 228. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 187, current session; without amendment (Rept. No. 284). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 232. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the hearings entitled "Mineral Treatment Processes for Percentage Depletion Purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 285). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 19. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Alaska the official flag of the United States bearing 49 stars which is first flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol; without amendment (Rept. No. 286). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 6353. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 288. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 6496. A bill to extend the application of the Motorboat Act of 1940 to certain possession of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6497. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Act by the addition of provisions relative to the certification of public accountants and the regulation of their practice; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 6498. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1762, Public Law 85-915), concerning payment of debts out of compensation for trust land on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation taken by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 6499. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6500. A bill to amend Public Law 85-818; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 6501. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 6503. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 6504. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

H.R. 6505. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6507. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act so as to enable States to establish more adequate general assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 6508. A bill to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 6509. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system of highways for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 6510. A bill to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 6511. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6512. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 6513. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce, for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, the age requirements from age 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6514. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H.R. 6515. A bill to maintain the domestic cobalt industry by increasing certain rates of duty and thereby decrease the dependence of the United States on foreign sources for this vital strategic and critical metal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 6516. A bill to approve a contract with the Conejas Water Conservancy District,

Colo., to ratify its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 6517. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN:

H.R. 6518. A bill to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, with respect to patents for plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6519. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such act to certain citizens and permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 6520. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits thereunder by 10 percent and to provide that full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 6521. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of a pension of \$100 per month to World War I veterans who have attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 6522. A bill to provide for the use of surplus agricultural commodities as emergency feed for wildlife in certain cases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 6523. A bill to add certain public lands in California to the Pala Indian Reservation, the Pauma Indian Reservation, and the Cleveland National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for the expenses incurred by a disabled person in traveling to and from work, and to provide additional personal exemptions for taxpayers, spouses, and dependents who are disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 6525. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the works of the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6526. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and help to build essential world conditions of peace, by the more effective use of U.S. agricultural commodities for the relief of human hunger, and for promoting economic and social development in less developed countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 6527. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the birth of Jesus Christ; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 6528. A bill to change the name of Kentucky Lake to Kentucky-Tennessee Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 6529. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1766, Public Law 85-916), concerning payment of debts out of compensation for trust land on the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation taken by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6530. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and help to build



essential world conditions of peace, by the more effective use of U.S. agricultural commodities for the relief of human hunger, and for promoting economic and social development in less developed countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 6531. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the works of the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 6532. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that the value of restricted Indian lands shall not be taken into account in determining the need of any Indian for such assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 6533. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421) with respect to restrictions on sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 6534. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada and between the United States and Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6535. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal assistance, under the program of aid to dependent children, for children whose father is unemployed as well as for those whose father is dead, disabled, or absent from home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6536. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans' benefits for individuals who served as contract surgeons during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6537. A bill to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 6538. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$3,600 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 6539. A bill to amend the act of December 18, 1942 (relating to research for utilization of coal), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a certain contract or contracts for research and to make certain grants to the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 6540. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6541. A bill to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 347. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a non-resident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COAD:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KASEM:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCGINLEY:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TELLER:  
H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:  
H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:  
H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution providing for an investigation of mental health programs which are being promoted; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN:  
H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution calling for a convention of delegates from the NATO countries to explore methods of achieving more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common interest; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:  
H. Res. 247. Resolution to authorize printing additional copies of House Document 57 (86th Cong.); to the Committee on House Administration.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to take steps to acquire, establish, and develop a Kettle Moraine National Park in Wisconsin to properly commemorate the glacial age; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to World War I veterans' pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a sliding scale tariff on lead imports for the purpose of combating excessive foreign imports on the market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make provision now for the inclusion of the convertible features during the initial construction of the new atomic reactor at Hanford; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:  
H.R. 6542. A bill for the relief of Tomislav Mrvica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:  
H.R. 6543. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:  
H.R. 6544. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yen Fue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6545. A bill for the relief of George Vargha (known as George Gracza) and his wife Joyce Mary Vargha (known as Joyce Mary Gracza); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:  
H.R. 6546. A bill for the relief of Nancy Mae Floor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:  
H.R. 6547. A bill for the relief of Manuel Cardoso, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:  
H.R. 6548. A bill for the relief of John S. Cardoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:  
H.R. 6549. A bill for the relief of Dominador D. Galdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

158. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 485 citizens of Waterloo, Iowa, urging that the burden of Government expenditures be reduced to the lowest practicable level and that a program of tax reform be instituted which would result, over a reasonable period of time and on an orderly basis, in a tax-rate structure—particularly in regard to the Federal income tax—which would be moderate at all levels and permit the maximum development of the Nation's economic potential. Petitions are herewith submitted by James Fox, president of the Waterloo Junior Chamber of Commerce, in connection with the organization's project tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

159. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the clerk, Orange County Board of Supervisors, Goshen, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting suspension of the operation of the so-called Byrd amendment to the Federal road program; to the Committee on Public Works.

160. Also, petition of Edmond P. Egan, Schenectady, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance against the Department of Justice, Secretary of the Navy, Civil Service Commission, and the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### Questions Dictator Castro Did Not Answer

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questions not answered by Fidel Castro:

First. You said that in case of war between the United States and Communist Russia, Cuba should remain neutral. Do you not think that such an attitude would work in Russia's favor?

Second. The Communist newspaper, Hoy, is now being printed in Havana on presses that you confiscated from their legal owners. Is your Government leasing these presses to the Communists, or did you sell them outright, or did you maybe give them to them?

Third. Former President Figuera, of Costa Rica, said in a speech in Cuba, that in the event of war, Latin American countries should support the United States. Why did you disagree publicly with Figuera on this point?

Fourth. People of the United States have always been friendly toward Cuba.

The U.S. Government made absolutely no effort to intervene in your revolution. Why did you say you were ready to kill 200,000 gringos if the United States stepped in to protect American lives and property they own in Cuba?

Fifth. You have said publicly that news agencies, newspapers, and magazines have lied about you and your Government publicly. Would you be specific just who lied?

Sixth. Is it true that unemployment has increased to an alarming degree since you took over the Government in Cuba? Unemployment in private enterprise as well as government agency unemployment?

Seventh. By the way, why did you recently suspend 2,500 schoolteachers?

Eighth. When you attacked army barracks in Santa Ana and were captured and then sentenced to 15 years in prison, Batista, then the head of the Cuban Government, let you out in about a year and a half. Since you have become President of Cuba, why do you not follow the same policies? Or do you find it easier to shoot your prisoners? Is it probably cheaper?

Ninth. You have been looked upon as a fighter in favor of a democracy, and antidictatorship man. Why then do you give orders to your courts, and even ask reversals of decisions from "not guilty"

to the "death sentence"? Is that democratic?

Tenth. In the famous trial of the 43 Air Force pilots which took place in Santiago, is it true that they were acquitted and that you showed your disapproval, and that therefore the attorneys were expelled from the courtroom and detained? Among them a lawyer who once defended you?

Is it not a fact that as a result of your orders, a new tribunal was formed under the supervision of your brother, Raul, and that he took the position of the district attorney, as well as the defense minister, and that he then accused his lawyers of being Batista sympathizers?

Eleventh. Is it not also true that these acquitted persons were tried all over again and the majority of them sentenced to 30 years at hard labor?

Twelfth. During the dictatorship which you fought against, the embassies in Havana had no trouble whatsoever in getting out of the country, those persons who took refuge in them? Why is there such a great contrast between what went on under Batista and what goes on today, regarding the right of refuge and asylum?

Thirteenth. You have said that the executions in Cuba would not exceed more than 400—yet there are well over 500 already, and 5,000 are still awaiting trial? Do you think such blood baths,



and such purges are becoming to a democratic government that professes love for humanity?

Fourteenth. Is it not true that your mother, Mrs. Lina Ruz Castro—your own mother—has said that during the Batista government she not only had personal guaranty of safety, but that her home and family properties were also protected? Would this policy not be better than the one your government presently engages in?

### Verrazzano Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 435 years ago, on April 17, 1524, the first white man entered New York Bay and discovered Manhattan Island.

This man was the great Italian navigator and explorer, Giovanni da Verrazzano; a man whose name should rank with those of Columbus, Vespucci, and Magellan, but who instead, has been largely forgotten and ignored. He is rarely, if ever, mentioned in the textbooks and his history is only known to a few scholars. Yet, the fact remains that, 85 years before Henry Hudson and 96 years before the *Mayflower* pilgrims, Verrazzano had come to these shores, explored them carefully, and told Europe about them.

Giovanni da Verrazzano was born near Florence about 1485. His family was engaged in the trading of spices, silk, and other precious commodities from the Orient. Quite early in life Giovanni acquired his geographical and nautical knowledge in Egypt and Syria. He made his first trip to the New World in 1508 at the age of 23. Some years later he attracted the attention of the King of France who decided to send Verrazzano to discover a northwest passage to Asia. In January 1524, therefore, the navigator set sail on the 100-ton, 3-masted *Dauphine*. More than 3 months later he landed on the coast of North Carolina and named the new continent Francesca, after the King. He then proceeded northward as far as Newfoundland. En route the *Dauphine* anchored in New York Bay and was greeted by a group of surprised Indians whom Verrazzano described as agreeable, friendly, and pleasant. Unfortunately, the stay was cut short by an unfavorable wind, but not before New York was given its first name of Angoulême. A few years after this historic expedition Verrazzano, while exploring new lands, was captured by the natives and killed.

The contributions of Verrazzano to American history are many. He was the first man to chart and name the harbors, bays, capes, and islands that he discovered, thus opening the path to other voyagers who have come to these shores in ever-growing numbers since

then. The principal merit of this great Italian, however, stems from the fact that he was the first European to sail to our shores with the express purpose of exploring them. His voyage has been called one of the most scientific and purposeful of all those made in the 16th century and his report of the voyage one of the most accurate of those written at that time.

Thus Verrazzano Day should serve to keep awake the appreciation and knowledge of our great historical heritage and as a reminder of the cultural relations between the Old and New Worlds that had their beginnings with the famous Florentine explorer, Giovanni da Verrazzano. It should also serve as just one more reminder of the great contributions made by the Italians to these United States.

From Verrazzano and Columbus down through the ages to La Guardia and Fermi the Italians have left their mark on American history and culture.

### Dr. Warren Tracy and Coe College Library

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, as the National Library Week draws to a close, I would like to salute the Stewart Memorial Library, which is a part of Coe College, one of the truly fine liberal arts colleges in my district.

The library, a gift of the late Col. Robert W. Stewart, has recently undergone a facility expansion and physical improvement program. The program, which amounted to \$37,763, includes a new lighting system, new stacks and study areas, and new draperies. Other improvements for the library include a microfilm and microcard reader and a verifax photo copier.

This fine progress in the Coe College Library can be attributed to the untiring work of Dr. Warren Tracy, and his fine staff. The staff includes Mrs. Warren Tracy, reference librarian; Mrs. Fred C. Fisher, Jr., and Mrs. Freda Chambers, circulation librarians; Mrs. Donald Stonemen, cataloger, and part-time student workers.

Dr. Tracy, who is now in his fifth year as head librarian, has done a remarkable job of rebuilding the library. With a few grants, and many long hours of work by Dr. Tracy, the library collection now includes 65,000 volumes and 280 periodicals—some dating before the 1900's. Under his leadership exhibits of wider cultural and artistic scope are going to be sponsored by the library similar to the current one; the Gertrude Stein exhibit.

It must be remembered that the universities with their large libraries are not fully responsible for the cultural growth of a city. But rather it is the small liberal arts college libraries, with their

small staffs, that have taken the cultural lead in the cities. These staffs, such as the one Dr. Tracy heads, have made the growth of their libraries a very personal one in which the entire city has benefited.

It is indeed an honor to give particular recognition to Dr. Warren Tracy and Coe College for their fine contribution to the liberal arts college library and to their city of Cedar Rapids.

### Toll Charges for the St. Lawrence Seaway Are Grossly Inadequate and Once Again the American Taxpayer Is Headed for Another Multi-Million-Dollar Ride

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently, it was announced that the United States and Canada had formally set the tolls which ships will be charged to use the St. Lawrence Seaway when it opens late in April. The tolls as announced for moving the length of the entire Seaway from Montreal to Lake Erie will be 6 cents on each ton of a ship's official weight plus 42 cents for each ton of bulk cargo or 95 cents a ton on general cargo.

In my opinion, these tolls will prove to be grossly inadequate and once again the poor taxpayer will be taken for another multi-million-dollar ride. The public who today pays for practically all of the costs of maintaining our entire system of inland waterways, is probably getting used to paying and paying for facilities which benefit only a handful. But that doesn't make it right.

It is inconceivable how the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the American principal in drafting the tolls, can accomplish with the announced tolls the mandate of the Congress which is self-liquidation within 50 years of the \$128 million cost. It is going to be utterly impossible to follow this mandate with inadequate toll charges which are based on highly speculative volumes and an estimate of prospective traffic volume which exceeds the practical capacity of the facilities soon to be opened.

In addition to the provisions of law regarding self-liquidation through toll revenues, there were important economic considerations which Congress must have certainly recognized when it was decided that tolls would be charged. One of the most important of these considerations was the Seaway's effect on the overall costs and adequacy of the Nation's transportation system. Unless the Seaway is fully self-supporting, with no element of subsidy to the users, it cannot possibly contribute to the true economy of the whole transportation picture. In a competitive transportation situation, inadequate tolls are going to

create uneconomic transportation patterns by shifting traffic from less costly methods to the more costly, subsidized method.

These inadequate toll charges which will not cover full costs place the railroads on a standby basis. This consequence will be all the more serious and disruptive because the Seaway is only a part-time transportation facility, whereas the Nation for its commerce and defense requires dependable transportation services in both summer and winter. The Nation's transportation requirements for defense obviously do not cease with the close of the navigation season, nor does its commerce hibernate.

Subsidizing the Seaway, through inadequate tolls, further aggravate these factors of instability, with seasonal disturbances of employment. This is in direct conflict with existing aims of national policy to encourage stability of employment conditions in the United States and in its several industries, including the railroads.

To arrive at the charges just announced, the Seaway Corporation, in estimating the annual tonnage that the Seaway could handle, is as far off first base as were the cost estimates presented in 1954 to the Congress to gain approval of the project. The cost estimates have now proven to be unrealistic and it is just a matter of time before there will be two outs. The official estimate of the annual capacity of the Seaway has been for some time 50 million tons—and now a Seaway official has said that it may reach 75 million tons. All I can say about both of these estimates is: fantastic. And I will tell you why.

The main purpose in deepening the St. Lawrence was to encourage oceangoing vessels having a draft of 27 feet or less to serve inland ports on the Great Lakes. In order to reach those ports, these ships must pass through the only connecting link between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, the Welland Canal.

The capacity of the Welland Canal has generally been recognized as the critical limiting factor governing the volume of traffic that can move through the Seaway. It is amazing to me why the U.S. Tolls Committee in its report of last June said nothing about this very vital matter although a press release accompanying the report mentioned a maximum tonnage of cargo of 60 million tons at Welland. There was absolutely no explanation of how the figure, which of course is totally unrealistic, was picked out of thin air.

The records show that the peak traffic volume through the Welland Canal was 23 million tons in 1956. While I realize that the deepening of the canal and the Seaway to allow passage of ships having drafts up to 27 feet will mean that ships with greater tonnage capacity will use the facilities, it is utterly ridiculous to assume that the tonnage capacity at Welland will ever within the foreseeable future reach 60 million tons a year. This, believe it or not, is more than 2½ times the traffic which has ever passed through the canal in 1 year.

Gentlemen, you must understand that the agreed-upon tolls were set using this

fantastic tonnage capacity as a starting point and I am sure you are wondering how the Government is ever going to recoup its investment. You can stop wondering because there is not one chance in a thousand that it will.

How am I going to tell my friends back in Altoona, Pa., where the only water we have is Brush Run, which is deep enough for canoes after the rainy season, that they are going to help pay for the deficit which the Government faces because of inadequate tolls for the Seaway? They already know they are helping to contribute close to \$40 million each year just to maintain navigation on our inland waterways system and many more millions to improve it. Soon they will be asked to help defray the costs of the Seaway.

And what about the Great Lakes, the nearest of which is almost 200 miles from my district. In a recent statement, commenting on the fact that the imposition of any tolls on the Seaway constituted a distinct threat to the economic well-being of the Great Lakes area, Adm. Lyndon Spencer, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, said:

The Great Lakes are a natural highway for moving grain from western growing centers to eastern consuming centers.

Certainly the Great Lakes are a natural highway that no ships could use unless harbors were deepened, locks maintained, and channels dredged. Do you know how much the Government has spent to date on this natural highway—more than \$500 million of your money and mine.

Many people have said that the recession caused most of the unemployment in the railroad industry that exists today. Perhaps it caused some layoffs, but to me a principal cause has and will continue to be the Government's subsidizing the water carriers. This must be curtailed.

But let us get back to the Welland Canal and its capacity. I wonder if the Development Corporation when it suggested the tolls which are supposed to cover the costs of the Seaway understood what the workable capacity of Welland meant. Certainly much more is involved than figuring the maximum number of lockages that can be performed per day and multiplying by the number of days in the navigation season to obtain a total of physical capacity in lockages. If they made this kind of mathematical caper, we are in for trouble.

In determining tonnage capacity, allowances should have been made for interruptions because of adverse weather and accidents. More important still is the fact that the traffic will not flow with uniform regularity all hours of the day, in all days of the peak month, in all months of the navigation season, or from one navigation season to another. These variations of traffic have a pronounced downward effect upon the practical capacity of the canal and should have been used as a basis in formulating toll levels to cover costs.

Available data clearly show that traffic at Welland is not evenly spaced throughout the navigation season, but starts off slowly, rises to a summer peak, and tapers off with the approach of cold

weather. Therefore, any calculation of Welland's capacity that treats every day or month of the navigation season as equivalent is certain to involve substantial error and cannot represent the effective capacity.

So it is also with respect to year-to-year variations in traffic resulting from fluctuations in the general economy. This simply means that the top capacity of Welland, whatever it may be, will not be used every year, owing to business fluctuations affecting such major commodities as ore, grain, coal, as well as others. On the average, over a period of years, it is unlikely for this reason that the full annual capacity of Welland would be used to a greater extent than 90 percent, since the capacity cannot be exceeded but utilization will frequently fall below it. Over the 10 years from 1948 through 1957, for example, the volume of bulk freight on the Great Lakes ranged from a high of 200 million tons in 1953 to a low of 151 million tons in 1954. A realistic determination of toll levels should have taken these cyclical fluctuations into account.

Summing up all of these pertinent considerations, and giving them a realistic evaluation, points out clearly that the effective capacity of Welland cannot exceed 40 million tons and will be less than that year in and year out. This would allow for a maximum of 7,200 transits, with more large vessels than have used the canal up to now and fewer possibilities than in the past for multiple transits. It also allows for greater average cargo tonnage per vessel transited, but there appears to be no reason to assume that the average cargo tons per transit will exceed 5,500 tons at any time in the foreseeable future, which is more than twice as great as the average in recent years. There will be very probably some larger vessels, but there will also continue to be many small ones and empty ones to keep the average size of the vessels from soaring as the unrestrained optimists have led us to believe.

I am sure that if you agree with my analysis of the cargo tonnage capacity of Welland, which I think is very realistic, it goes without saying that the 40 million ton figure provides the top limit of tonnage that should have been taken as a basis for determining appropriate tolls for the St. Lawrence Seaway and for Welland.

Unfortunately for the taxpayer, the Tolls Committee in recognition of the functional relationship between the St. Lawrence and the Welland Canal has set the maximum seaway traffic at 50 million tons compared with 60 million tons for Welland. The difference of 10 million tons is principally accounted for by interlake traffic which does not use the St. Lawrence River. Very probably this interlake traffic will expand and further reduce the remaining seaway traffic potential as affected by Welland.

Since my analysis shows that the Tolls Committee has overestimated the Welland capacity by at least 20 million tons, it has likewise overestimated the available traffic potential of the Seaway in the St. Lawrence by at least the same amount. Hence, the maximum traffic for



the Seaway will be no more than 30 million tons instead of 50 million tons. This means that the Seaway revenues as calculated by the Tolls Committee on the basis of the agreed upon tolls will suffice to cover only 60 percent of the Seaway costs, thus falling far short of the requirements of law with respect to self-liquidation.

It is indeed unfortunate that those responsible for setting the tolls did not fully take into account a realistic tonnage capacity for Welland. If they had it would have been clear that considerably higher tolls were necessary to effect self-liquidation within the required period. I am sure the higher tolls would not have discouraged ships from using the Seaway because traffic that will become firmly attached to this route as the most advantageous means of transportation can afford to pay full-cost tolls. I can see no need to offer a bargain variety of tolls for traffic which can be realistically expected to develop for the Seaway on an economic basis. And yet, this is what has been done as the Seaway prepares to open for its navigation season.

Although the law states that a review of the situation must be made before July 1, 1964, this is much too long to wait if we are ever going to rectify the mistakes that have already been made. I therefore strongly urge that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation should insist that, after the close of the navigation season in 1960, a review of the toll charges be made to determine how much the tolls should be raised. After two full seasons, sufficient statistics should have been developed which will show whether we are collecting enough to cover our costs. I am sure these figures when they are made public, will show the absolute necessity for making an upward readjustment of tolls for the Seaway and the canal.

### Social Security Makes Nickel-Shooter of Ponzi

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks I submit the following broadcast I made over the Manion Forum Network on Sunday evening, April 12, 1959, when discussing the inequities and faults of our present old age security insurance system. I do so principally for the enlightenment and edification of the many new Members of Congress.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY MAKES NICKEL-SHOOTER OF PONZI

Dean MANION. I think it was Mark Twain who first said that everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it. With our social security system, it is just the opposite. Everybody pays for it, but practically nobody talks about it.

The clever Washington bureaucrats who manage the involved, inexplicable mishmash, known as the Federal social security system, have made it into a political sacred cow. No matter where it roams, what it does, or how precariously it teeters on the brink of bankruptcy, no politician who equates his own chances for reelection with the public interest will dare to remonstrate.

In the handbook of practical politics, it says that all the ambitious Congressman is supposed to do about social security is to raise the benefits and spread the coverage. If he should happen to question the obvious vandalism of thus burning the taxpayer's candle at both ends, he will be deluged with vituperation as a calloused enemy of our needy old people.

Fortunately, there are a few Congressmen in Washington who do not quail before the menacing public relations octopus of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and who thus dare to tell the awful truth about our present social security system.

I have one of these courageous Congressmen with me at this microphone now. Representative NOAH MORGAN MASON, of Illinois, has been a Member of Congress for 20 years. His firmly established reputation for honest, enlightened statesmanship enabled him to throw away the political handbook years ago. I am sure you will agree that his candor is refreshing and that his logic is irrefutable.

Here is my greatly respected friend, Congressman MASON.

Congressman MASON. Thank you, Dean Manion, for those kind words of introduction. I am both honored and delighted to be given this opportunity to speak to your Sunday evening radio audience on the subject of social security. It is a difficult subject to understand or to explain.

Our present social security setup is unsound, inequitable and dishonest. The Brookings Institution, one of the best research organizations in the United States today, after a careful and exhaustive study, recommended that our social security setup be scrapped, abandoned, and that a pay-as-you-go social security program be established in its place.

I agree with that recommendation. If it were adopted and carried out, it would mean, as the Brookings Institution expresses it: "Our generation would care for its own old people and trust future generations to do likewise."

In 1950, after 3½ months of exhaustive hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, I was one of the three members of that committee who voted "no" on a bill that proposed to expand the coverage of social security and to increase the benefits. I was also 1 of 14 House Members to vote "no" on the final passage of that bill in the House.

Since then, I have opposed every attempt to expand our social security program, to increase its benefits, or to increase the social security tax rates. Yet, I am heartily in favor of a sound, liberal social security program to take care of our needy old people.

#### UN SOUND, DISHONEST, INEQUITABLE

The overwhelming weight of the evidence gathered during the 3½ months of public hearings in 1950 was to the effect that our present social security setup was unsound, dishonest, and inequitable, that it was "a Ponzi-type shell game," sold to the American people, by F.D.R. and his New Deal associates, as a plan to provide security in their old age.

It is an insurance program which if practiced by any insurance company today would land every director and every official of that company in the penitentiary for misuse or misappropriation of trust funds.

The present social security program is characterized in a report of the Brookings

Institution as a plan whereby "we (the present generation) do the promising; you (all future generations) do the paying." That is an accurate picture of our present social security program.

The following social security facts bear out these contentions; they cannot be ignored:

First. When the social security law was adopted in 1934, it provided that all money collected in social security taxes should be dumped into the Federal Treasury and that such cash could be used for the general expenditures of the Government, placing Government I O U's or bonds into the social security fund in lieu of the cash as a book-keeping arrangement. That provision is still in the law.

Second. Under the law, some \$50 billion has been collected in social security taxes, but less than half that amount has been paid out in benefits. The balance—all spent for the general expenditures of the Government—is a debt that has been placed upon the backs of future generations.

Taxing American workers to get money to pay social security benefits to the workers upon retirement, then spending half the money collected for other purposes is neither fair nor equitable.

Third. Our social security program, since its inception, has been used for political purposes by both parties. In election years, benefits have been increased to attract votes for the party in power, thereby making the social security fund actuarially unsound.

Then, in the off-election year, the social security tax rates have been increased to try to get the fund back on an actuarially sound basis. (If that is not playing politics with the welfare of our retired old people, I do not know what is.)

Fourth. The original purpose of the social security program was to establish a floor of security under the low-income worker for support in his old age. He was then expected to build upon that floor added security by buying insurance, by establishing a savings account, or by making investments with his extra cash.

To make this possible, a tax was levied only upon the first \$2,000 of the worker's income. Today, we levy a tax upon the first \$4,800 of the worker's income, leaving little if any cash for the taxpayer to invest for himself.

We have entirely forgotten the original purpose of social security. Today, Uncle Sam acts as though the worker is not capable of spending his own money wisely, for security in his old age; therefore, the Government must do it for him.

#### SHOULD BE ON PAY-AS-YOU-GO BASIS

These facts—and they are facts—added to the evidence given in the public hearings in 1950, convince me that we should, without further delay, adopt the social security recommendations of the Brookings Institution and place the social security program upon a cash basis—a pay-as-you-go basis.

If we did that, it would eliminate the present yearly \$500 million interest charge upon our fictitious social security fund—which will soon become a \$1 billion interest charge.

It also would do away with all need for reserves, all need for level premiums, all need for costly and elaborate bookkeeping systems, all need for the present heavy administrative costs of social security, and it would make possible the payment of more liberal social security benefits to our retired old people in the lower income brackets. That in itself would be well worthwhile.

To demonstrate how unsound and dishonest our present social security program is, I offer the following hypothetical case:

John Smith decides to establish his own social security program, so he deducts a certain percent of each pay check he receives

and places the cash regularly in his safe deposit box. After doing this for several years and having thus set aside, say, \$5,000, to insure security in his old age, John Smith starts to spend each month more than he earns—as Uncle Sam does now.

Then, John Smith hits upon the plan of taking a certain amount of cash out of his lockbox each month to spend, placing in the box, in lieu of the cash extracted, promissory notes to himself. If John Smith keeps this up, when he retires he will have only promissory notes to himself to live on—which he has no way of changing into cash for groceries.

That is exactly what Uncle Sam is doing with the social security tax receipts—the only difference being that Uncle Sam has the general taxing power to invoke in order to change his I O U's into cash to meet his future social security obligations.

But, that means of course new taxes, additional taxes, to meet obligations that are supposed to have been paid for already by the beneficiaries.

I wonder if that scheme of taxing the children and grandchildren of the social security beneficiary for something he and his employer are supposed to have paid for can be called anything but dishonest and immoral, a Ponzi-type shell game that has been sold to the American taxpayer as a plan to provide security in his old age.

For years I have been working in Congress, not to abolish social security, as some people would have you believe, but rather to place our social security program upon a sound basis, a cash basis, a pay-as-you-go basis, collecting each year just the amount of social security taxes needed to pay the benefits due that year for the support of our retired old people.

In that way—paraphrasing the words of the Brookings Institution report—we (the present generation) would take care of our own old people, and you (all future generations) would be expected to do likewise. To my mind, that would be the sensible thing to do in connection with our social security problem.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Congressman NOAH MASON. Now, my friends, do you see any reason why the irrefutable truth that Congressman MASON has just spoken should not be brought to the millions who are now being ruthlessly taxed under the false pretense that they are thus providing for their old age?

We must take care of our needy old people and that is the very reason why the present so-called social security system, which is merely taxation with misrepresentation, should be changed for something that will do the necessary job.

Send Congressman MASON's speech to your Congressman. Ask him to give you his frank opinion on the merits of what Congressman MASON has suggested.

**Lewis L. Strauss**

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most honorable gentlemen, courageous and patriotic men, able and dedicated public servants it has been my privilege to know is Lewis L. Strauss. He is gentle; he is kind; he is humble; he possesses the quality of greatness that in our history such rare men as he have

given as a heritage to the Nation. At the moment he is enduring a prolonged and difficult personal trial. It is good that those who know, admire, and respect him speak words of encouragement at this time.

#### Anniversary of Lincoln's West Virginia Statehood Proclamation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. KEN HECHLER**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, today is an important date in the history of my home State of West Virginia. On this date 96 years ago, the Great Emancipator, President Abraham Lincoln, signed the proclamation that designated West Virginia a new State.

The actual admission of West Virginia into the Union came 60 days later, on June 20, 1863, under the terms of President Lincoln's proclamation. This latter date is celebrated as West Virginia Day in our State, but the confirmation of its entry into the Union occurred on April 20.

President Lincoln, sorely beset by the crushing burden of wartime leadership, probably had little time to reflect on the consequences and importance of his action. But there is little doubt that the formation of this new State was widely acclaimed. The courageous stand against slavery—and particularly against being drawn into war with the indissoluble Union—which the hardy and independent mountain folk had taken was thus rewarded with status as a free and equal State, and deservedly so.

It is an oversimplification, however, to say that the western counties broke away from the mother State over the issue of slavery alone. This was a contributing factor, but not the only one by any means.

There had long been sentiment for the creation of a separate State west of the crest of the Appalachians.

Geographically, the mountaineers who settled the slopes and valleys of West Virginia were much closer to their neighbors in the Ohio Valley than to other sections.

By sentiment, too, the western Virginian belonged with his hardy counterparts in Kentucky and Ohio. The mountaineer, struggling to forge a better life for his family amid the towering, forbidding mountains, felt that the voice of the mountain dweller—then as today—was not always heard.

Thus, we can see that in many respects—in fact, in almost all respects—the stage was set for West Virginia statehood long before the slave issue set the Nation aflame. There had been repeated efforts to form a separate State long before the war triggered the final break.

West Virginia has come a long way since then. Vast deposits of untold mineral wealth have poured from her

mountains, particularly in the unbelievably rich coalfields to the south. Chemical, glass and steel manufacturers have chosen the many resources of the State in the manufacture of their products. Her forests are still undepleted, although millions of feet of timber have been taken from her majestic hills.

This growth might have been slowed, might possibly never have attained its present stature at all, had not President Lincoln determined to permit this economic entity to become a separate State 96 years ago today.

Today, the State of West Virginia already is making forward-looking plans for its centennial, 4 years hence in 1963. Already, elaborate preparations are being made to pay fitting tribute to a great State entering its second century. Realistic and thoughtful planning is being done in regard to West Virginia's future, in an attempt to assure that the second century will be even greater in achievement than the first.

It is only fitting that we pause, as these many preparations gain momentum, to pay tribute to the great American who affixed his signature to the document that proclaimed West Virginia's birth, during the year that marks the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Under unanimous consent I at this point insert the text of Abraham Lincoln's proclamation of April 20, 1863:

PROCLAMATION ADMITTING WEST VIRGINIA INTO THE UNION, APRIL 20, 1863, BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas by the act of Congress approved the 31st day of December last, the State of West Virginia was declared to be one of the United States of America, and was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, upon the condition that certain changes should be duly made in the proposed constitution for that State; and

Whereas proof of a compliance with that condition, as required by the second section of the act aforesaid, has been submitted to me:

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do hereby, in pursuance of the act of Congress aforesaid, declare and proclaim that the said act shall take effect and be in force from and after 60 days from the date hereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this 20th day of April, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and of the independence of the United States the 87th.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,  
Secretary of State.

#### District Home Rule

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in his famous Cataline oration, that great



Roman statesman, Cicero, spoke seven words which legions of schoolboys over the intervening centuries have committed to memory. These words are:

Quo usque tandem abutere, Catalina, patientia nostra.

How long, oh Catalina, will you abuse our patience?

The sense of frustration which Cicero expressed in the Roman Senate is one that we experience from time to time in this modern forum of representative government.

It is one that aptly describes my personal sentiments when I contemplate the situation of home-rule legislation in this body today. After years of study and despite the broad support for this bill, we have, at this hour, gotten exactly nowhere in obtaining consideration of the bill by the District Committee.

It is not as if this legislation were new or revolutionary. This home-rule bill has passed the Senate four times in the last five Congresses. It is presently being heard by the Senate District Committee.

It is not that there is no interest in the bill. Twenty-three Members of this House, of both parties, have introduced the legislation.

It is not that the bill has no urgency attached to it. The president of the District Commissioners has characterized it as the most important piece of legislation affecting the District before the Congress.

Nor can one say that there is little sentiment in favor of home rule in the District itself. In the District Democratic primary of 1956, nearly 80 percent of the voters expressed their support. Similarly, in a recent Republican mail poll, two-thirds were for it.

No, it is not lack of support, lack of interest or lack of importance that have stalled action. It is because there is wide support and interest—because the majority of the Members of this House are anxious to vote in favor of home-rule legislation—that the legislative process has been obstructed. Such obstructionism abuses our patience. How long will it last?

### Washington Report

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 18, 1959:

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, April 18, 1959)

Cherry blossoms amid balmy weather, snow, and bright 80-degree sunshine, in that order, make a strange week—but that's spring in Washington. Visitors are everywhere, enjoying sightseeing. Republican women from Dallas, Tex., and the Nation are here, holding their annual conference. It's a

compliment to Congressmen to have visitors from home who will take the time to observe the legislative process. A Congressman's job would be better understood if constituents could see the committee work, where hearings are held and legislation fashioned. Then, the floor work in the House, and finally the endless office routine of correspondence over the problems of constituents. Frequently, all activities are simultaneous.

The Federal Government has grown so large in recent years it is now likely that legislation suffers from a lack of study by the Congressmen, who are besieged with countless other duties. Worse yet, this fact will go unrecognized so that Government getting out of hand will not be blamed on the right cause, namely, too little time to do too many things. Other charges will be made, and more legislation devised to correct legislation. Meanwhile, the water is muddied further by political parties that choose up sides with too hasty study of the facts. Only as a result of careful study of alternatives can the successful solutions to today's problems be found. Often, the obvious is most difficult to see. (Item: A Member sent a package of sightsavers made in his district to each Congressman saying, "We are entering that period of the session when budget figures will be flying fast and furiously. I trust these will assist you in seeing the figures more clearly.")

The military construction bill totaled \$1,251 million for defense construction, \$131 million of which is outside the United States and \$548 million approximately is classified (secret). The bill includes such items as operational and training facilities, maintenance, research and development and test, hospital and medical facilities, housing, utilities and real estate. Texas' part is \$28 million, including \$348,000 for Dallas' Naval Air Station and \$64,000 for the Army Reserve Center.

The military is big business in this Nation, even in this relatively small construction end. In fact, defense expenditures are so great and so integral a part of this Nation's economy, I wonder what would happen if Russia actually wanted peace, and we were suddenly faced with disarmament and demilitarizing. Could a nation of free people and business rooted in free enterprise survive competitively, as compared to the regimented societies of totalitarian states where people can be ordered about? Here's one to think about.

The Bob Taft Memorial Carillon Tower symbolizes the side of America that everyone can cherish and in remembering try to emulate, thanking God for the opportunity and freedom to do so. At the dedication these qualities came to the forefront, and refreshingly, without apology. Bob Taft laid down principles and then followed them, even when odds were great, when pressures against him were almost unbearable. Ambition and power were sacrificed when he relinquished seniority privileges to join another committee to write a labor law, which he reasoned then was the Nation's great need. Conscience was his guide, not political popularity. And when it came time to die, knowing this in advance, he met this without missing a stride. As he told Herbert Hoover, who urged him to go to the hospital, "My friend, you know what is the matter with me. I am going to die with my boots on." Here's American manhood at its best. As Mr. Hoover said, "In the belfry of this monument there is a magnificent carillon. When these great bells ring out, it will be a summons to integrity and courage." Congressmen should hear and heed these bells. Bob Taft's memory will help all Americans.

Our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, was resoundingly praised in the House when his retirement from office was announced. I wondered why he couldn't have received some of this praise earlier when in-

stead his critics were denouncing him, chiefly for his unyielding firmness toward Russia. Like Taft, he may be appreciated more in the future, when those who counseled him to give in to Russia are long forgotten.

Why are so many of our greatest and strongest men removed from the scene when they are so badly needed? Lincoln, Taft, Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall, to name only three of the many. An even heavier load is distributed among those who remain. In this world we have a big job to do for ourselves, our children, and future generations. To this task we had better dedicate ourselves.

Remembering Taft's beliefs in the role of Federal Government would be so helpful today. For example: "This was the way America was built up. The only way to resume progress is to assure people again that Government will not interfere with their normal and reasonable efforts to make a living; that Government will not take away from them the profit which they make; that reasonable success will receive the recognition it deserves."

### International Aspects of Education

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in the March 12 issue of the County Herald, the journal of the Jefferson County (Ala.) Teachers Association, there was published an article which I prepared for this periodical entitled "International Aspects of Education." With the thought that the article might be of interest to the Members of Congress, I am pleased to insert same herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF EDUCATION

We tend, so very often, to think about education in terms of the local viewpoint only. When education is mentioned our thoughts run straight to underpaid teachers, to crowded classrooms, to inadequate counseling and guidance for students, to the current American debate between the progressive educationists and the neorthodox three R's supporters, and the question of whether Johnny and Janie can read. It is all well and good that we should indeed think first in terms of local education, for it is, obviously, on the local front that our efforts in behalf of better educational systems and methods and facilities have the most effect. Or I should say, it is on the city and county and State educational levels that we can most readily tell whether our efforts are having any effect whatsoever.

In any case, it is natural to consider education to be an immediate and intimate concern. What subject is there that receives more comment in the discussion of local affairs than this? Indeed, all of us talk about education and its needs, many of us worry about the problem, and a lot of us even try to do something about it.

Nevertheless, even if it is well and good and natural to think on education from the standpoint of what it means to Birmingham or Graysville or Shades Mountain, to Jefferson or Lamar or Baldwin Counties, or to the State of Alabama, I think we are detracting from the significance of the word if we do not extend our concept and consideration of education to an international scope.

How trite it must seem to you to read that your Congressman says that "the world is growing smaller each day" and that "today's foreigners are tomorrow's neighbors." And yet, how true. Is there anyone who has failed to be awed by the fact that jet planes and, more frightening, intercontinental ballistic missiles have stretched the meaning of "proximity" to include the entire world; distance is now so relative a term that it is measured in minutes and hours and only very rarely still in miles.

"Fly to Atlanta in 31 minutes," invites a local airline office. By the time most of you straighten up your desks at the end of the day, gather up your papers to grade and that complicated old Register to work on, and finally arrive home, the business executive who left Birmingham by plane at 3 p.m. is halfway to Washington. And on Saturday, if you are able to indulge yourselves and sleep 'til noon, do you realize that the tourist who boarded the jet airliner in New York at 6:30 a.m.—the time you ordinarily have to get up—is now almost able to see the West England shore?

In saying that the world is becoming ever-smaller, we actually should be able to mean that our own private worlds are being enlarged. This brings us rather abruptly to one of the main points I am trying to make: education, as we look at it in and from Alabama, is, like travel, today necessarily considered universal in breadth. What we are doing in our local schools should not be automatically divorced from what the rest of the world is attempting to do in and through its educational institutions.

And yet there arises at this point a rather stinging question. If science and research and advanced knowledge—if education, in its broadest sense—have brought the nations of the world so close together, in the connotation that distance barriers have been broken down, what have science and technical skills and general education done to bring those human beings affected by this collapse of isolating geographical boundaries closer together from a different and more important standpoint?

How ironic it is that in an age when it is proclaimed that the moon is shortly to be visited by man, said man cannot seem to bridge the cultural gap between himself and people of the next hemisphere. How ironic that in an age when the suggestion that we may soon have to deal with Martians is not always made jestingly, Americans cannot not only not deal successfully and peacefully with the Russians who are their earthly enemies, but cannot even understand and deal with their longtime friends and neighbors in Latin America without great difficulty and many unnecessary misunderstandings.

I now proceed to answer part of that stinging question of what is being done in the field of education to narrow the cultural distances that still cause us to be in large measure intellectually confined to our own backyards. I will attempt to give only part of the answer because there is another part, even the most vital part, of the question that you yourselves must provide the answer to, and that is this: whatever we have done and are doing educationally to bring mankind on earth closer together in understanding and mutual appreciation, is it the right thing and have we done enough of it?

Perhaps my giving one answer to the question will enable you to consider more intelligently what your completing answer shall be. It is my hope that this is the case.

What America has done in international education is, quite naturally, largely synonymous with what the U.S. Government has done. By far the largest programs of international educational exchange are supported, totally or in part, by the Federal Govern-

ment. But as these programs are based on the approval and support of the electorate, the Government's efforts in this field can, without stretching the point excessively, be equated with the efforts of the American people.

It was in connection with President Roosevelt's good neighbor policy with Latin America that the U.S. Government made its first significant commitment in the field of international education. A year after the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations had met in Buenos Aires in 1936, the Congress of the United States gave statutory authority for a broad program of exchange of persons between the United States and other American Republics to the end of extending scientific, technical, and general cultural relations with these countries.

The Second World War interrupted continuing development of such programs. It was that war, however, which was surely the most singularly shocking factor in our final realization that international cultural and educational exchanges were vitally necessary if peace was to prevail, however shakily, in the world. Thus it was that at the end of the war the U.S. Congress overwhelmingly approved a measure introduced by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, to use some of the currencies and credits of other countries acquired by the United States through the sale of surplus property abroad for educational purposes. Two years later, in 1948, the United States Informational and Educational Exchange Act (often called the Smith-Mundt Act) authorized a worldwide program of broad purposes. Its intent was to "enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase the mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries," by providing for "an educational service to cooperate with other nations in (a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills; (b) the rendering of technical and other services; and (c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences."

In addition, several other acts of Congress have provided for particular and distinctive educational exchanges with specific countries; such agreements exist with Finland and India, for example.

Aside from the international educational exchange programs which are operated mainly under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts by the Department of State, there are two other principal programs that relate to higher education. One is the program of educational activities of the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) which includes mainly the technical cooperation program authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The other is the basic program of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) which is largely educational in nature and includes distinctly educational pursuits and aids.

There are some programs of international exchange on the secondary school level that are partially supported by the Government and I shall shortly deal with them and raise the question of whether they should receive extended support.

To summarize briefly the differences between the main programs related to higher education in general, the primary objective of the Smith-Mundt and the Fulbright programs is to increase international understanding to understanding abroad of the United States, its culture, and its foreign policy. This is done by sending American grantees abroad and bringing foreign nationals to this country, keeping this prime objective in mind. The specific educational or technical activities of the individuals involved in this program are of secondary interest.

In the ICA program, in contrast, the primary objective is to increase some specific technical competence abroad with specific ICA-sponsored projects. For example, prior to the building of a dam in Iran using joint American and Iranian funds, U.S. technicians are selected and sent overseas and/or Iranian engineers are brought to this country with the objective of accomplishing a particular technical-educational aim relative to the project.

The USIA has a multipurposed and broad-ranged field of activity. Through their offices located in principal foreign cities, they disseminate general information about the United States to anyone who requests it. Aside from sponsoring regular programs, such as providing public libraries where foreigners can obtain copies of every important American literary work, the USIA cooperates with American teacher-grantees by providing them background information for lectures, films on various aspects of our country, and such free souvenirs as maps of the United States to be distributed. They are also called upon to provide similar information to such study groups, civic organizations, and particular individuals as request them in those areas where there are offices of the Agency. There is no doubt that the USIA activity of supplying millions of dollars worth of American texts to foreign universities and secondary schools markedly affects instruction in these educational institutions, and this is particularly true in the underdeveloped countries.

Under the Fulbright Act of 1946, particular bilateral arrangements were authorized between the United States and individual nations. Made through the executive branch of the Government, these agreements provide for the exchange of persons for educational purposes. By the present time, 39 countries have concluded agreements with the United States to participate in this program. This program also permits granting of scholarships to foreign nationals to study in American-sponsored schools abroad. In the first year of its implemented existence (1948), the act saw an exchange of some 237 persons. This number has increased steadily, with the increased number of bilateral agreements involved, until by 1957 there were some 6,000 participants in the program that year. About one-third of these were Americans who went abroad to study at the university or graduate level, to teach on secondary or university level, to engage in particular research projects, to act as consultants to foreign governments or organizations, or to lecture before general audiences on topics of current interest. The remaining two-thirds of the participants were foreign nationals who engaged generally in the same type activities in this country.

Under the Smith-Mundt Act, which calls for exchange of persons for the same type purpose but promotes more specifically programs sponsored by academic institutions, libraries, nonprofit organizations, and business and industrial organizations, the number of persons participating each year has also grown to about 6,000 in the past few years. Under both the Smith-Mundt Act and the Fulbright Act, over 50,000 persons have participated in this international educational exchange.

The total cost of the two programs has grown to almost \$25 million per annum, but it is well to remember that this is in large measure provided by what amounts to interest on wartime loans to foreign nations and by the sale of surplus property in foreign countries claimed by the United States as partial payment of debts owed to our Government by those countries.

There are several other programs carried on by the Government that should be mentioned. One of these is the cultural presentations staff, established by Congress in 1954 at the request of the President, which has



undertaken a program to assist cultural and athletic groups with foreign tours. This proved to be such a successful venture that 2 years after the program was set up by Congress on an emergency basis, it was made into a continuing activity by that body in an act approved August 1, 1956. Under the auspices of this program, over 2,500 American artists and athletes have performed in over 90 foreign countries.

This activity, along with special ones like our presentations at the recent World's Fair at Brussels, may not in the strictest sense deal with education. But it does, after all, educate those who view the presentations, of whatever nature, in the ways of American culture and tradition, and does so in a manner that perhaps cannot be equaled in any other way.

One of the most recent developments in the area of educational and cultural exchanges was the recent agreement between our Government and the U.S.S.R. to swap movies, radio, and television broadcasts, and magazines as well as exchange professors and graduate students for a period of 2 years, beginning in January 1958. Other exchanges are to take place between athletic teams and outstanding entertainment groups and artists. The most significant venture on the part of the United States under this agreement is the upcoming merchandise fair our Government is sponsoring in Moscow to show off our outstanding peaceable commodities, commonplace to us but which the average Russian will surely look on in wonder. Who can doubt whether this will make for good propaganda for our Nation in Russia?

In other areas of student exchange outside the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts, the State Department also makes a contribution. Each year for the past several years, the Department has given grants-in-aid to such groups as the American Field Service. This is the largest of 5 privately sponsored organizations that promotes the exchange of students on the high school level. It is this program which perhaps presents the most interesting aspect of international education to you, for foreign exchange students are currently placed in several schools in Birmingham, Jefferson County, and Alabama. Perhaps you know first hand how very much one student from Norway or France or Germany can do to increase your students' interest in that country and to increase even community interest in learning about social and educational practices of foreign countries. Even a spark of such interest, when kindled by an interesting personality in the form of an exchange student, can result in solid friendships and greater mutual appreciation.

And I think I should mention that even a more important result of having exchange students in our high schools is that our young Americans take another look at our own culture and our own institutions in order better to answer the questions put to them by the "foreigner"; they know that for him it is not just an academic question, as is the case when a teacher poses it and already knows the book answer, but an innocent and sincere one that demands a thoughtful reply.

This program of high school student exchanges reached a number of 1,500 participants in 1958. They came from 38 countries. The Government subsidy of this program, in the form of grants-in-aid from the Department of State amounted to \$125,000 in that year, a very small sum compared to the amounts spent in connection with exchanges on the university and higher educational levels. I wonder if it is your experience that this program is sufficiently worthwhile to be enlarged and to receive greater Government support?

To refer again to the program affecting higher education, a recent survey was made by the U.S. Advisory Commission of Educa-

tional Exchange of the views of college presidents whose institutions were involved in student and teacher international exchanges. These men indicated their belief that the program has benefited higher education in several particular ways. One was that the caliber of the foreign scholarship winners to the United States was so superior that it enabled admissions officers to set up proper criteria for admitting other foreign students who wish to study independently. Another was that foreign students make important contributions to academic and community life especially through the interpretation of their cultures to the American people. They further said that presence of foreign students on the campus stimulates among the student body and faculty an increased interest in foreign affairs, and this is particularly true as regards those individuals who do not specialize in foreign languages or international affairs.

That the effect of those who have studied or taught abroad is beneficial to the institution to which an individual returns in the United States is, I think, almost universally true. There can be no question that foreign study is an immense boon to language teachers.

And finally, in most instances, those Americans who go abroad to teach, study, lecture, or engage in research, are generally successful in presenting the American way of life, the American culture, and the American viewpoint.

It will perhaps be of particular interest to you to have the report of a friend of mine recently returned from a year's study in Europe that even regional American cultures and traditions are appreciated by the European student of America. He states that one of the most popular courses taught at the University of Strasbourg, by an American Fulbright professor of English, was on the works of Mark Twain. Thus a greater understanding of America and Americans was gained by analyzing a particular region during a particular period. This should be reassuring to those of us who are concerned lest our friends across the seas think of us in terms of Brooklyn accents and Hollywood riches.

There have, of course, been areas of dissatisfaction with these programs. Foreign students complain sometimes that they have not been able to get the type of education for which they came here. Some have manifested a general inability to adjust appropriately to the American system of education which differs so widely from their own. Likewise, Americans gone abroad to study or teach often find that language barriers and local social customs sometimes make it extremely difficult to become sufficiently acquainted with the local populace to do any educating along the general lines proposed as the main point of the program, that is, the familiarization of foreign friends with the American culture and viewpoint.

One of these difficulties, it might be mentioned here, is the result of our all too meager emphasis on foreign languages in secondary and higher education. It is to be hoped this situation will shortly be ameliorated.

Such then is the general picture of the program of international education currently being carried on by the U.S. Government. It is not by any means the complete picture, but perhaps it will suffice to stir your thoughts and inquiries on the subject. I insist again that it is indeed important that you and I, along with those who are perhaps not so intimately connected with education, do take time to consider the subject from an international viewpoint.

Those who are today's students are tomorrow's teachers of men; and if there is a student or a potential student in any part of the world who is today denied access to the light of truth, it may well be he who helps bring darkness on the world tomorrow.

## U.S.S. "Bryce Canyon": U.S. Good Will

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective instruments for creating goodwill abroad for the United States of America has come to be the officers and men of the U.S. Navy. Wherever they travel the wearers of our naval uniform regard gaining respect and friendship for our country as important a part of the duty to which they have devoted themselves as manning and fighting their ships if ever needs be.

Officers and men of the U.S.S. *Bryce Canyon*, homeported at Long Beach, Calif., and now serving in the Philippines, are typical of Americans in uniform doubling as people-to-people ambassadors of goodwill.

Recently, within little more than a week's period, several fine gestures of friendship to the people of the Philippines were signalled from the *Bryce Canyon*.

The ship established a \$500 scholarship trust fund to provide a young Filipino of Olongapo with a year's instruction at the Feati Institute of Technology in Manila.

In announcing the scholarship, Capt. E. H. Steinmetz, USN, commanding officer of the destroyer tender, said:

Our officers and men raised the funds to provide an opportunity for a particularly deserving young man of Olongapo to further his education in the industrial arts field. The young man to be selected must have a demonstrated aptitude and capability for training in the industrial arts, must be of excellent character and moral integrity, must be financially unable to continue his education without assistance and must not be directly related to any active or retired U.S. Armed Forces personnel.

The *Bryce Canyon* spends most of her time in port at Subic Bay—

Captain Steinmetz explained—

and in appreciation of the very good relations we enjoy with the Philippine citizens of Olongapo we wanted to offer some needy young man with ability the chance to go to college. We wanted to demonstrate our thanks to his townspeople for their many kindnesses to us.

Just a few days earlier 11 officers and men of the *Bryce Canyon* had gone ashore on a mission of mercy. A 38-year-old woman lay dying in the Olongapo Hospital suffering from severe anemia, jaundice, and a severe gall bladder condition. The hospital had no blood bank and only a limited blood supply. The woman required a pint of blood a day if she was to live.

No call went out, no one requested any blood, but the word leaked back to the *Bryce Canyon* that someone needed help. True to their ship's motto, "Always ready," the crewmen literally rushed to the hospital and gave 11 pints of healthy blood.

Grateful for the blood donations, the doctors served, to the surprise and pleasure of the donors, two rounds of local Philippine Island beer stating: "Beer is the best medicine for rebuilding the red blood corpuscles."

The woman's condition is still uncertain, but the Filipino doctors believe she will live, and the men of the *Bryce Canyon* have given their stamp of approval to Filipino blood-building techniques.

This act, in its turn, was preceded only a few days by a visit of several officers and men of the *Bryce Canyon* to a nearby pigmy village to donate over 150 pounds of food to its people.

The pigmies, called Negritos in the Philippines, are a very poor people and make their livelihood selling bows and arrows as souvenirs in the town of Olongapo. In the days of old they were a savage headhunting tribe but civilization has slowly caught up with and passed them. They live in the hills near the Subic Bay Naval Base, in bamboo huts.

Among the food given the pigmies was dry milk. This was the first time the pigmies had seen milk of such a dry consistency but after shown how to mix the milk they expressed their amazement and gratitude for the food.

Meanwhile, being constructed aboard the *Bryce Canyon* is a giant flagpole for the Philippine Boy Scout camp at Manila, which will be the site of the World Boy Scout Jamboree beginning July 17.

These are but examples of the kind spirit of America exhibited by the many ships and many men of the U.S. Navy in many lands throughout the world. To them all, a grateful Nation says, "Well done, U.S. Navy."

## State Taxation of Nonresidents

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following statement which I made before the Senate subcommittee conducting hearings on the problems of State taxation of nonresidents:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RODINO ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 29 AND 67 RELATING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS ON STATE TAXATION OF NONRESIDENTS

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the subcommittee for permitting me to make this statement concerning the problems covered by Senate Joint Resolutions 29 and 67 prohibiting or limiting the States in the taxing of incomes of nonresidents. Being a Representative in Congress from New Jersey, I am intimately and deeply concerned with this taxing problem. My own feeling in the matter results from the present discriminatory practice of New York in its taxation of New Jersey residents.

As you doubtless will recall, the legislature of New Jersey in 1957 adopted a resolu-

tion, Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, petitioning the Congress of the United States to adopt a constitutional amendment which would prohibit States from taxing the income of nonresidents. As a result of that petition, I sponsored in the 85th Congress House Joint Resolution 497. Simultaneously 12 bills similar to my own were introduced in Congress, principally from Members representing districts in the States of New Jersey and Connecticut. About a month after the legislature of New Jersey petitioned Congress, the State of Connecticut also petitioned the Congress (S.J. Res. 9) asking that the Congress convene a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution to prohibit States from taxing the income of nonresidents.

At my request, the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary caused a preliminary study to be made of the issues involved in this problem. A memorandum, containing the arguments pro and con, was prepared by one of the counsel of the House Committee on the Judiciary in collaboration with the American Law Section of the Library of Congress, and dated February 13, 1958—a year and 2 months ago—which I wish to submit for the subcommittee's record. (Document attached to end of statement.)

To my mind, the most effective way to deal with this problem of discriminatory taxation is a constitutional amendment eliminating the power. However, such a solution would be most difficult to accomplish since 31 States presently tax the in-State incomes of nonresidents and the membership of Congress from those States would be reluctant to go along with such legislation. In addition, the approach would require a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress and ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. It is unlikely that the taxing States would ratify the proposed change.

Perhaps it is appropriate at this point to mention that the major concern of the 31 taxing States has not been whether nonresidents should be exempted or given equitable tax deductions but rather how best to protect their own residents from double taxation on out-of-State income.

The authority of a State to impose a taxation on income earned within the State by a nonresident was declared over 40 years ago by the decisions in *Shaffer v. Carter* (252 U.S. 37 (1920)) and *Travis v. Yale and Towne Mfg. Co.* (252 U.S. 60 (1920)).

Last year, after the preliminary studies were made, it seemed wiser, in view of the obstacles presented by the Constitutional amendment approach, to intensify efforts at the State level for the negotiation with New York for more equitable tax treatment of New Jersey residents.

Presently, a resident of New York may deduct from gross income such items as municipal taxes on his residence property, sales taxes, mortgage and personal loans, medical expenses within specified limits, premiums on hospitalization insurance, and gifts for charitable, religious and benevolent purposes.

A nonresident on the other hand may deduct from his taxable gross income in New York only an amount equal to 10 percent of such gross income or \$500 whichever is less. While he may itemize his deductions, he may claim only those expenditures incurred in the production of income in New York, and such items as gifts to charitable, religious and benevolent corporations, if organized or operated under the laws of New York.

From an equitable point it seems to many of us that the nonresident taxpayer should be permitted to claim as deductions not only those expenses incurred arising in New York but also, on an apportionment basis, those deductions ordinarily allowed resident taxpayers.

In an effort to broaden deductions conferences were held among Governors Meyner of New Jersey, Harriman of New York, and Ribicoff of Connecticut.

Among other things, a Commission on Out-of-State Taxation of New Jersey Residents was created under Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 (1957) by the New Jersey Legislature. Also, a study was made by Mr. Theodore Tannenwald, Jr. for Governor Harriman of New York in which he recommended enlarging certain deductions for out-of-State residents who must pay New York State taxes on personal income.

As disclosed in the newspapers of recent dates, New York did revise its tax laws but the only gain nonresidents received is a change in the flat sum they may claim in lieu of itemized deductions. Under New York's new law, this is raised from \$500 to \$1,000. The revision will not change the fact that the nonresident will pay considerably more tax than the resident with the same income, despite the fact that the nonresident is ineligible for many of that State's services.

According to latest figures, over 137,000 New Jersey residents working in New York are paying more than \$20 million yearly to New York; Connecticut residents pay over 8 million.

When the 86th Congress convened in January, I reintroduced my bills. They are now designated House Joint Resolution 68 and H.R. 4174. House Joint Resolution 68 calls for a constitutional amendment; H.R. 4174 an interstate compact. To date, five methods have been suggested for dealing with the problem:

1. Constitutional amendment proposed by Congress, prohibiting State taxation of nonresident incomes.

2. Constitutional convention to prohibit State taxation of nonresident incomes.

3. An interstate compact permitting uniform tax treatment of all nonresidents through State agreement.

4. A national or uniform reciprocal law not to discriminate between residents and nonresidents in the levying and collection of taxes.

5. Federal preemption through the interstate commerce clause.

The first method enumerated above is the subject matter of the bills now before the subcommittee.

The State of Connecticut has asked for a constitutional convention under the second method of approach. This ostensibly could take the matter out of the hands of Congress and place it before a convention. However, there has not been a constitutional convention in the 169 years of our existence and, besides, 33 States must ask for it before one is in order.

So far as I know, the interstate compact approach was first suggested on June 3, 1958, at a hearing in Trenton, N.J., before the Commission on Out of State Taxation of New Jersey residents. In substance, the compact would grant the States the power to enter into agreements looking toward uniform tax treatment of nonresidents. It may be argued by some that such an approach is unnecessary since the States now have the power to enter into such agreements. While this is doubtless true, I nonetheless feel that a compact arrangement could have salutary effect because it would permit the States to make binding agreements containing penalty and other provisions. In the event of a breach of the agreement by one of the participating States, remedies, if it were so provided in the agreement, could be brought in our courts.

The fourth suggested approach concerns a national uniform law. As you know, we have many laws which are not Federal laws in the sense that they are enacted by Congress but are nevertheless national in scope in that they can affect all of the several



States. Some of these laws are the Uniform Negotiable Instruments Act, the uniform extradition laws, and the uniform reciprocal enforcement of support laws. These laws come about by the drafting of so-called model acts which contain standard provisions and which are submitted to the States for adoption by the State legislatures and, of course, are binding on all States which adopt them. In the past such laws have been drafted by the Council of State Governments and by the American Law Institute. Certainly, it is within the realm of possibility that these organizations working singly or in conjunction with each other, and with agencies of the Federal Government and/or the Congress, could promulgate a model act for uniform tax treatment of nonresidents with strong enforcement provisions so that the States would be required to give full credence to its provisions.

The fifth suggestion, and one which in my opinion offers the best approach, is a Federal preemption law. Congress has plenary powers over interstate commerce. In some areas it exercises exclusive and absolute control; in others it shares concurrent jurisdiction with the States, and in still other areas it permits the States to occupy the field alone. It is my understanding that Congress under its interstate commerce power could deny to the States the right to tax the incomes of nonresidents where the organizations that employ them are engaged, either in whole or in part, in interstate commerce. It may be that the States should be denied this power of taxation absolutely. It may be that they should be denied it only in certain areas. I feel that this preemption approach merits serious study, looking toward Federal legislation which would restrict the States in this area of taxation so as to guarantee to nonresidents fair and equitable treatment.

As you know, the Supreme Court recently handed down a decision holding, in line with its decision some 40 years earlier, that States may tax the incomes of foreign corporations on activities within the taxing State which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce. (*Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. v. Minnesota*.) I have been advised that the Senate Small Business Committee and the House Committee on the Judiciary, among others, have this decision under study.

Mr. Chairman, this problem is not confined to New York, New Jersey, or Connecticut or to any one region of the United States but is national in scope and effect. It affects all 49 States. It affects not only Minnesota in the northwestern part of our country, but it affects Georgia in the South. In recent months, newspapers have carried accounts of difficulties between Maryland and Virginia; Idaho and North Dakota have a similar problem. Pennsylvania and Delaware, as well as New Jersey and the city of Philadelphia, are also engaged in controversy concerning the taxation of nonresidents.

Mr. Chairman, the unfair and discriminatory actions now being imposed upon some of our citizens simply because their employment requires them to cross State lines must cease. If the States are unwilling to work the problem out at the State level through agreements, compacts, uniform laws, or otherwise, then the Federal Government, through its powers of preemption or by constitutional amendment, should bring about that which the States refuse or are incapable of accomplishing.

ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT STATES FROM LEVYING INCOME TAXES ON NONRESIDENTS (H.J. RES. 497, 85TH CONG.)

#### PRO

In legal theory the income tax is considered to be a levy against the person, not against property or the process which creates

the income. (Taxes (1955) 33:375.) Being a personal tax it should be levied by the State of residence which provides protection and services to its inhabitants and to their property.

It is incorrect to contend that the nonresident receives the same benefits from the taxing State as do residents thereof. The nonresident does not avail himself of schools, hospitals, and kindred services that are afforded in the taxing State.

To require a nonresident to pay a contribution toward the expenses of a State in which he happens to earn money is to require him to pay something which in public policy and according to right and justice he does not owe.

It is also contrary to the theory of State income tax that a tax should be levied on nonresidents in respect of any income they derive from property owned or business conducted in the State which imposes said tax. The tax is justified as a payment for personal benefits which residents of a State derive from the government under which they are domiciled, and should not apply to nonresidents, who must be presumed to be taxed (and are taxed through various other forms of taxation) for such benefits in the State where they live. Any attempt to impose the tax upon income received by nonresidents from property situated, or business carried on, within the State changes the character of the tax and converts it into a payment, not for personal benefits derived by residents, but for benefits of a totally different nature such as business benefits, etc. These objections are not to be interpreted as meaning that a State cannot levy a tax for such benefits, but merely that it should not do so in the form of a personal income tax.

The contributions and services rendered by a multitude of nonresidents to the general business prosperity and productivity of a State seeking to impose the income tax largely outweigh an expenses of police protection afforded by the latter State.

Only by adoption of a constitutional amendment will it be possible to end once and for all the inequities which result when the taxing State denies to nonresidents the same measure of deductions as it accords to residents. Litigation to remove this inequity having been unsuccessful, the proposed amendment alone can be depended upon to effect a much-needed reform (*Charles Goodwin, Jr. v. New York State Tax Commission* (1955) 146 NYS 2d 172; (1956) 1 N.Y. 2d 680; appeal dismissed (1956) 352 U.S. 805).

Thus a nonresident earning the same salary as a resident is denied the privilege extended to the latter of claiming deductions for sums contributed to his church, for taxes paid on his residence, for medical expenses or for premiums paid for hospitalization insurance, for interest accruing on mortgages or other evidences of indebtedness, or for capital losses incurred. The nonresident cannot take deductions for any of these outlays for the reason that they do not represent expenditures incurred in the taxing State or borne as part of the cost of earning income therein. As a consequence, a nonresident whose only source of income is his salary earned in the taxing State is compelled to pay a higher tax thereon than a resident of said State receiving the same amount of income.

The need for the proposed amendment is not avoided by suggesting that inequities resulting from the taxation of nonresidents can be eliminated by the uniform levy by all States of income taxes applicable to incomes of both nonresidents and residents. States whose citizens are unjustly treated by the tax laws of neighboring States are under no obligation to submit to dictation by the latter and to emulate the latter in the matter of tax legislation. Moreover, discrimination inflicted upon nonresidents by

one State is not to be corrected by the adoption of retaliatory legislation by other States.

Justification of the proposed amendment is not refuted by contending that discriminatory State taxation of the income of nonresidents has been judicially sustained for almost 40 years. The Supreme Court expressed its approval of such practice at a time when State income taxes virtually were a rarity. Upon reconsideration of such discriminatory taxation today, the Court might well be expected to reach a result in harmony with the spirit of the proposed amendment.

By refusing to grant to nonresidents the same measure of deductions which they extend to their own inhabitants the States levying taxes on personal income in effect are erecting discriminatory barriers to the free movement of citizens across State lines which the framers of the Constitution sought to guarantee through the privileges and immunities clause of article 4 of the Constitution. Through discrimination in the measure of deductions, taxing States are making it impossible for out-of-State workers to obtain employment on the same terms of net remuneration as are available to their residents.

#### CON

Inasmuch as virtually all of the 31 States levying income taxes extend the same to nonresidents, the only beneficiaries of the proposed amendment will be the nonresidents from the minority of States which levy no taxes on personal income. No comparable benefit will accrue to residents of income tax States who work and earn their living in States levying no income tax; for such residents are taxed by the State of their domicile on their entire income from whatever source received.

The proposed amendment is contrary to the spirit of the privileges and immunities clause of article 4 of the Constitution; for it would confer on nonresident employees most of the privileges of residents but exempt them from obligations borne by the latter.

Nonresidents who enjoy the advantages of employment and the receipt of income within a State are morally as well as legally obligated to pay a quid pro quo in the form of a tax on income earned in such State.

In subjecting nonresidents to income taxes the States are applying the same rule as is contained in the Federal income tax law pursuant to which nonresident aliens and foreigners are taxed on income from sources within the United States.

The proposed amendment would adversely affect those States which, by reason of being highly industrialized or constituting financial centers, serve as a source of livelihood for thousands of out-of-State commuters.

Inasmuch as the principal grievance assigned in support of the proposed amendment arises not out of the levy of an income tax on nonresidents but from alleged inequities in the deductions available respectively to residents and nonresidents, it is clear that the remedy sought to be invoked is in excess of that required. Mere amendment of State income tax legislation is primarily needed and this can be achieved through negotiations at the State level, rather than by utilization of the difficult to obtain process of constitutional amendment.

Thus defenses offered in support of this amendment would be eliminated if States taxing the income of nonresidents would permit the latter to claim deductions in the same ratio as their income received in the taxing State bears to their total income received from all sources. Under this statutory change, nonresidents earning their entire income in the taxing State would be eligible to claim all of the deductions hitherto extended only to residents. Moreover, it has been estimated that the States effecting such amendment of their income tax laws would suffer no appreciable loss of revenue.

The taxing States do not levy, as they do in the case of their own residents, on the entire income of nonresidents. It is, therefore, entirely appropriate and equitable for these States to withhold from nonresidents the same measure of deductions as are accorded to residents. The validity of this distinction in the measure of deductions granted has been upheld by the courts (*Chas. Goodwin, Jr. v. New York State Tax Commission* ((1955) 146 N.Y.S. 2d 172; (1956) 1 N.Y. 2d 680; appeals dismissed (1956) 352 U.S. 805)).

If State A imposes no tax on the income of its own residents, why should the latter, who carry on their business or earn their livelihood in State B in competition with citizens of State B, be exempt from taxation

on income by State B? To erect such exemption into a general rule would result not only to the disadvantage of citizens of State B but would encourage every citizen of State B who desired to escape taxes to transfer his legal residence to a country home in State A.

Irrespective of his place of domicile the owner of income-producing property or the recipient of income within a State has the right to call upon the government of that State for protection of his rights. Accordingly, he is under a corresponding obligation to pay taxes, including income taxes, to defray the cost of such protection.

In seeking to recover revenues lost by adoption of the proposed amendment States

might be encouraged to levy novel taxes on business establishments which would have the effect of discouraging them from hiring out-of-State employees.

Of the 31 States levying taxes on personal income all but 2 grant their residents a credit for taxes levied on them as nonresidents by other States. Hence the burden alleged to be produced by multiple taxation is grossly exaggerated.

For almost 40 years collection of State income taxes from nonresidents has been sustained as constitutional (*Travis v. Yale and Towne Mfg. Co.* (1920) 252 U.S. 60)). The proposed amendment thus would overturn a mode of taxation that has met the test of time.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1959

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with soiled face and hands unclean with the dust of earthly toil, in this moment of communion with the unseen, we would come to the crystal waters of Thy restoring grace.

As those set aside to prescribe for the ills of an ailing social order, we pray that Thou will first cleanse our own souls from moral pollution and mental darkness.

In a world where the worst wars constantly against the best, open our eyes to invisible allies which fight by the side of those who keep step with the drumbeat of Thy will—invincible forces which at last will bend and break the spears of evil.

When the sadness of the world creeps into our own eyes, and we are plagued with our own inadequacy for these violent times which try and test our souls, stand Thou in splendor before us like the light, like love all lovely, like the morning which slays the shadows.

We ask it in the name of that One whose life is the light of the world. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 20, 1959, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2100. An act for the relief of John F. Carmody;

H.R. 3825. An act for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell;

H.R. 4012. An act to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Depart-

ment of Agriculture, and for related purposes;

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) authorizing reprinting of House Document 451 of the 84th Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 2100. An act for the relief of John F. Carmody;

H.R. 3825. An act for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell;

H.R. 4012. An act to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for related purposes;

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) authorizing reprinting of House Document 451 of the 84th Congress was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 451 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS; and that there be

printed one hundred and thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Foreign Relations Committee.

The Committee on Finance.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Insurance Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON THE 1958 REVISION OF EAST-WEST TRADE CONTROLS

A letter from the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 1958 Revision of East-West Trade Controls (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.